

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE *Jewish Quarterly Review*, which began in the year 1888, ended in the year 1908. It was edited by Mr. Israel ABRAHAMS and Mr. Claude G. MONTEFIORE. Out of its ashes have arisen two Reviews, a new *Jewish Quarterly Review*, to be edited by Professor Felix ADLER and Professor SCHECHTER in Philadelphia, and the *Jewish Review*, to be edited by Mr. Norman BENTWICH and Dr. Joseph HOCHMAN, and to be published by Messrs. Routledge & Sons in London.

The first number of the *Jewish Review* has been published. Its most significant article is a review of Mr. MONTEFIORE'S volume on *The Synoptic Gospels*. The review is signed by Mr. Gerald FRIEDLANDER. The signing of reviews is a feature of the number. It does not seem to mean that the editors decline responsibility for the reviewers' opinions. In this instance at any rate reviewer and editors are evidently at one. For in the editorial notes we are told that while the *Jewish Review* is to provide a platform for the discussion of Jewish questions in a critical and scientific spirit, yet 'in its religious views it will be frankly conservative,' and that 'we stand for traditional Judaism.' The reviewer of Mr. MONTEFIORE'S book stands for traditional Judaism.

Mr. MONTEFIORE believes that the religion of the future will be 'a developed and purified

VOL. XXI.—No. 10.—JULY 1910.

Judaism,' upon which Mr. FRIEDLANDER remarks that his exposition of Liberal Judaism 'leaves little to differentiate it from that modern phase of Christianity preached in the New Theology, and known as Unitarianism.' From the developed and purified Judaism which is to be the religion of the future, Mr. MONTEFIORE hopes that the name of 'perhaps the greatest, as certainly of its most potent and influential teacher, will not be excluded.' Mr. FRIEDLANDER will have nothing to do with Jesus.

'We are amazed,' he says, 'by the reverence and affection displayed by Montefiore for Jesus.' And lest Mr. MONTEFIORE or any other should reply that he does not know the Jesus of the Gospels, Mr. FRIEDLANDER proceeds at once to declare his knowledge. 'Montefiore,' he says, 'frequently dwells on the "pity" motive of Jesus.' Mr. FRIEDLANDER does not believe in it. When Mr. MONTEFIORE asserts that 'in this pity, this profound and yearning compassion, there lies probably a true and fundamental characteristic of the historic Jesus,' the reviewer demands proof to support the statement. He refers to Mt 8^{11, 12}, 'And I say unto you, that many shall come from the east and the west, and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven: but the children of the kingdom shall be cast forth into the outer darkness; there shall be the weeping

and gnashing of teeth.' In that passage, he says, 'Jesus excludes all the people from the peace and happiness of his kingdom, and without the least pity, sentences them to the outer darkness, to weeping and gnashing of teeth.'

But Mr. FRIEDLANDER's sorest complaint is that Mr. MONTEFIORE approves of the principle of Jesus that there is 'no such thing as religious impurity in a material sense.' It 'cuts athwart the whole scheme of dietary laws.' It 'abrogates the distinction between clean and unclean which forms an important part of Jewish life.' He calls it an inept principle—'one of the most inept principles in the Gospels'—and he evidently thinks that it will not work. For 'is not drunkenness the curse of England, the cause of nearly all the crime and misery? And yet Mr. MONTEFIORE approves of the saying that there is nothing outside a man, which entering into him can make him unclean' (Mk 7^{15, 18}).

The *Jewish Quarterly Review* of Philadelphia has not appeared yet. But in the *Open Court* for April there is an article by a liberal Jew which may be set beside the review of Mr. MONTEFIORE's book. The article is written by Rabbi A. P. DRUCKER, of whom the editor of the *Open Court* says that he is a member of the Conference of American Rabbis and of the Rabbinical Association of Chicago. The title of the article is 'The Old Testament as a Text-Book.'

Rabbi DRUCKER thinks the time has come for both Jews and Christians to give up the Old Testament as a text-book. We have now reached that stage of religious development which was attained by ancient Greece in the days of Plato. It was during the lifetime of this philosopher that the discovery was made that the old myths and stories about the gods were unsuited to the people's advanced philosophical and religious conceptions. We to-day, says Rabbi DRUCKER, are confronted with the same difficulty in regard to the Bible. He holds that we have not only surpassed the

teachings of the Bible, but have also outgrown its very conception of God. And he is not afraid to say of the stories in the Bible what Plato said of the deeds of the gods, that 'they corrupt the virtues of the people.'

By the Bible Rabbi DRUCKER means, of course, the Old Testament. Now it may be that only the Jews are bound to defend the morality of the Old Testament. Our Lord's 'I say unto you,' it may be claimed, frees the Christian from the necessity. Yet this is a matter of a little more than curiosity to the Christian. We have joined with the Jews in making the Old Testament a text-book. We retain it as a text-book even in these days of 'advanced philosophical and religious conceptions.' What objection, then, has Rabbi DRUCKER to the God of the Old Testament?

He is jealous, he says, and revengeful. He covets honour and praise. He is even cruel and barbarous. And for illustration he refers to the destruction of the Canaanites, the anger of His prophet Moses at the sparing of the Midianite women, the denunciation of Saul for suffering the king of the Amalekites to live, and the death of Uzzah for steadying the ark.

More seriously, the God of the Old Testament, says Rabbi DRUCKER, is untruthful. 'We read unblinkingly how he bids Moses tell Pharaoh that the Children of Israel are to leave Egypt for a three days' journey only, when in reality he is planning that they shall never return.' He also orders the Israelites to borrow gold and silver vessels, ornaments and jewellery, from the Egyptians under false pretences. And he shows himself 'hardly less vainglorious than untruthful,' for he hardens Pharaoh's heart so that he will not suffer the Israelites to depart, 'for a mere whim, to prove his strength, to show off, as it were.'

Last of all, Rabbi DRUCKER makes the charge that Yahawe (the spelling 'indicates the pronunciation used at the Jewish Theological Seminary of

New York') is depicted in the Old Testament as ignorant of the future. He is so ignorant that he made man, and then when he found out the mistake, sent a flood to exterminate him. And he is ignorant in smaller matters as well as in greater. He sends Saul to be anointed by Samuel, and then repents that he has set him up to be king and sends Samuel to take the kingdom from him.

Well, we have heard all this before. And perhaps we have not been so much disturbed by it as we should have been. But what will the Jews do with it who are 'frankly conservative' and 'stand for traditional Judaism'? What will the Jews do with it who are amazed at the reverence paid to Jesus, and do not know the God and Father of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ?

'Come now, and let us reason together, saith the LORD: though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow; though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool' (Is 1¹⁸). The passage is well quoted after an attack on the Old Testament. How many passages in the New have brought as much consolation to sinning men?

But is the passage correctly translated? The latest commentaries on Isaiah are those of Mr. G. H. BOX and Professor GUTHE, the former being published independently in 1908, and the latter as part of the new edition of KAUTZSCH'S *Die heilige Schrift des A.T.* in 1909. And both these commentaries offer the translation, first suggested by WELLHAUSEN, which turns the promise into a question.

Mr. C. F. BURNEY discusses the translation of the passage in the *Journal of Theological Studies* for April. He quotes the translation of Mr. Box:

Come now let us argue together, says Jahweh:

If your sins be as scarlet
shall they become white as snow?

If they be red as crimson
shall they become as wool?

And he quotes the vindication which Mr. BOX offers in a footnote: 'The language of promise and forgiveness is quite out of keeping with the stern logic of a legal plea.'

First, then, is it a legal plea? Mr. BURNEY admits that it is usually understood so to be. But he does not believe it. The case for the court of justice, he says, rests on the one word translated in the Authorized and Revised Versions, 'let us reason together.' This word Dr. SKINNER translates, 'let us implead one another,' and adds: 'The idea is that of a legal process in which each party maintains his own case.' Mr. BURNEY examines the use of the verb elsewhere. He comes to the conclusion that the meaning here is 'let us right ourselves,' which he takes to mean 'let us enter into right relations with one another.'

With this translation the necessity of finding ourselves in a court of justice vanishes. Mr. BURNEY recommends us to rid our minds of the idea of a judgment-scene, and connect vv. 18-20 with the passage immediately preceding. Then the opening words of v. 16, 'Wash you, make you clean,' will show that the idea of the washing away of sins, even so heinous as those of apostate Israel, is prominent in the prophet's mind.

Nor will Mr. BURNEY allow that so gracious an offer of forgiveness is inconsistent with Isaiah's idea of the character of Jahweh. Certainly Isaiah has conceived the idea that the holiness of Jahweh is awful and unique. But where has he expressed its awfulness most emphatically? It is in that sixth chapter in which he describes his own call and the keen sense of his own sinfulness which the vision of God's holiness produced in him. Now in that passage the prophet's sin is as graciously forgiven, and the word that is used to declare it—'purged' is the translation—contains the same idea of wiping away and making bright and clean as is prominent in the verse before us.

But against the translation which would turn the

promise into a rhetorical query, Mr. BURNEY has another argument. If this is a question, there is no interrogative particle to tell us so. If it is a question, the question is left to be asked by the speaker's tone of voice. Mr. BURNEY does not believe that there is another instance of a sentence such as this, in which a question is left to be asked by the tone of voice of the speaker.

No site in Palestine has been held to be more surely established than the site of Jacob's Well. But the Rev. Asad MANSUR, Pastor of Christ Church, Nazareth, suspects the identification. He has published his suspicion and the reasons for it in the *Statement of the Palestine Exploration Fund* for April.

His first reason for rejecting the claim of the present well to be Jacob's Well, is that Jacob's Well was near to a city of Samaria called Sychar. Where was Sychar? Some say Sychar is a local corruption of the name Shechem; some say a deliberate corruption to express the intemperance of that Samaritan city, Sychar meaning 'drunken.' Mr. MANSUR believes that Sychar and Shechem are distinct names, but that Sychar was just outside the walls of Shechem, to which it formed a suburb, where wine was pressed or sold, or where public-houses were built.

His second objection is that Jacob is nowhere said to have dug a well where 'Jacob's Well' is now found, and there would have been no sense in his doing so. For there was, and is, plenty of spring water in the neighbourhood, which could be reached without any of the digging that this deep well must have demanded.

His third reason is, even if there was a well in our Lord's day where the present 'Jacob's Well' is found, the woman of Samaria was not likely to pass all the other excellent and accessible wells in order to draw water from it. Mr. MANSUR is aware that this objection has been met in two ways. It

has been suggested that the woman was at work in the fields and came to Jacob's Well as nearest, to get water both for herself and for those who may have been working in the field with her. To that Mr. MANSUR replies by pointing to the season of the year. It was yet four months till the harvest, and as the harvest begins in the middle of April, the time was the middle of December. What could the woman be doing in the field at that season? And even if she were in the field and at work,—though what the nature of the work could be, no one can tell,—still there would be no need for a rope and water-jar to find water then. A small jar filled from a house or from some fountain on the way would be sufficient at that time of year both for herself and for any others who might be with her.

The other way to meet the objection is to suggest that Jacob's Well was a sacred well. The woman may in her piety have passed all the other wells purposely in order to draw water from this well with its sacred associations. To which Mr. MANSUR replies that this woman's character before her conversion is well known to us. He cannot conceive that she would feel more respect for a holy place than other women in her town.

His last reason is that the present 'Jacob's Well' is probably not a well at all, and never could have served the purpose either of Jacob or of the woman of Samaria. Mr. MANSUR does not believe that the present Jacob's Well is more than a cistern. It is dry in summer, and the water that is found in it in winter drains into it, he believes, from its sides. 'When I was in Nâblius in the month of March, I was told that the monks bring the water to the well from the village of Askar.'

Mr. MANSUR's own opinion is that the well at which our Lord conversed with the woman of Samaria was in the north of the city of Shechem. Opposite to that quarter of the present town of Shechem, which is now known by the name of *Hâret el-Hableh*, there is an opening in Mount

Ebal, with gardens and fields. 'I feel much inclined to reckon this opening as the parcel of a field which Jacob bought and in which he dug the well. There are several springs in the *Hâret el-Hableh*, and wherever you dig to a depth of fifteen feet or even ten, the water springs up in a copious fountain. There is a well here called the Well of the Prophets, on which a Muhammadan mosque has been built, called *el-Anbia* ('the prophets'), and by the word 'prophets' the Muslims mean 'the sons of Jacob.' I venture to believe, then, that if Jacob dug a well in the neighbourhood, it is to be identified with this well or some well near it.

There are sermons for undergraduates, and there are sermons for others. But even the undergraduates who listened to the sermon preached by Professor INGE before the University of Cambridge, and published in the *Guardian* for May 13, must have been gratified by the compliment paid to their penetration. The subject of the sermon was the apocalyptic element in Christ's teaching.

It is the most difficult subject to handle in all the range of Apostolic Christianity. And its difficulty is at its greatest. It is, as Professor INGE calls it, 'the storm-centre of Christian apologetics at the present time.'

The early Christians looked upon the Ascension as little more than the necessary preliminary to their Lord's return. In the words of Professor INGE, it was 'the penultimate scene of a drama which was very shortly to have its *dénouement* by the reappearance of the Messiah on the clouds of heaven.' This is a fact which, however unwelcome, we must face. And recent critics of Christianity are determined that we shall face it, together with all that follows from it. But while this is one fact, there is another fact which also has to be faced. If the coming of Christ is represented in the New Testament as immediate, it is also represented as dim and distant, the end (if the end at all) of a long, slow process of growth.

Nothing, says Professor INGE, but our uncritical manner of studying Holy Scripture could have hidden from us so long the double thread which runs, entangled but not united, through the New Testament. On the one side, we have the whole scheme of salvation presented to us under the forms of time and place. The place is Judæa. The time is the generation of men then living. God's final interposition—the 'coming' of Christ—is to be external, sudden, violent, wholly miraculous. And it is bound up with certain beliefs about the structure of the universe. The earth is, as it were, the first floor of a three-storied building. Jerusalem is the centre of the earth. And the end of all things is at hand.

On the other side, there is a Kingdom which is in this world but is not of it. Christ is the Head of it. The indwelling Spirit of Christ is its guiding star. It passes through a long probation as a Church militant, its practice based on the counsels and the example of its Head. And salvation is the attainment of eternal life—that is to say, of a higher state of existence, beyond this bourne of time and space, a blessed state to be fully realized in the future, but which in a measure may be realized on earth.

We are now told that Christianity began with the former of these conceptions, and ended with the latter. 'All through St. Paul's Epistles we can trace the gradual evanescence of the crude Messianic belief, and the approximation to the spiritual religion which we find in the Epistle to the Hebrews; and in a still more advanced form in the Fourth Gospel.'

And Professor INGE does not deny that this is so. But the serious aspect of the matter is seen when it is further asserted that our Lord Himself knew only the former conception of the Kingdom. It is asserted that Jesus 'never contemplated founding a Church or instituting a rule of life for future generations; that His one message was "the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand"—or, in

modern language, that the world was coming to an end. He went about warning His countrymen of an impending catastrophe, in which all existing conditions would be subverted, and a supernatural Messianic reign established.'

Now, if this view of the preaching of Christ is accurate and adequate, Professor INGE is not mistaken when he says that Christianity is 'torn up by the roots.' For these predictions were falsified in every particular. And the same critics allow us to claim very little else as His authentic teaching. 'It is true that there are some Christians, both Roman Catholics and Protestants, who do not regard this treatment of our Lord as intolerable. I confess,' says Professor Inge, 'that I can neither agree with their arguments nor understand their position.'

But both conceptions are there. And they are contradictory. How does Professor INGE propose to resolve the contradiction?

Well, in the first place, he will not allow us to retain the lazy belief into which we have fallen, that Christ promised to return to the earth at a far distant date, which was unknown to Himself. It is true, we are told that the day and the hour were unknown; but the predictions, as they stand in our documents, clearly assert that the return, or 'coming,' of the Son of Man was imminent. He will not allow us, therefore, to say that the disciples simply antedated the fulfilment of the prophecy and that it still holds good. Professor INGE then uses these serious words: 'Our Lord is recorded in the Gospels to have made predictions which certainly have not been, and cannot now be, fulfilled—predictions, moreover, which, if they were an essential part of His message, must have profoundly modified the whole of His practical teaching, making it only suited to the brief interval before the end of all things should come.'

So there is no doubt about the difficulty of the

subject. How does Professor INGE propose to deal with it? It was when he proceeded to his proposals for dealing with it that the undergraduates who listened to him must have recognized the compliment which was paid to their penetration. If they were students of psychology, that might have made it easier for them to follow. Professor INGE considers the subject mainly from the psychological side. For he thinks that the solution of the problem must be found in that region. He begins with John the Baptist.

John the Baptist preached a moral preparation for a supernatural catastrophe. So did Jesus. Indeed, He used identical language. But note the difference in meaning. Jesus had a doctrine of Fatherhood. John had not. By means of His doctrine of the Fatherhood of God, Jesus was able to make His preaching of repentance and the imminence of judgment a message of mercy and of hope. John preached judgment to come, pure and simple. He had no way of connecting moral amendment with the impending catastrophe so as to change the centre of gravity from fear to love. Jesus also urged repentance in view of the imminent end. But the repentance He preached was the first step in a life of filial obedience and joy.

Whereupon the Jewish apocalyptic ideas began to lose their force and to pass away. The apocalyptic language was still used. But it was now only the husk: Jewish Messianism was shattered from within. The disciples did not see this at once. They knew that some great change was taking place. Their minds were filled with a great hope, a dazzling, blinding hope, which only grew stronger after the tragic end of the earthly mission. Their Master was restored to them. He was with them still. The Kingdom of God was creating itself in their hearts. They felt that they were living in the very hour of the fulfilment of prophecy, and they could use, and did use, the old familiar language, but they used it with a new meaning. 'When a man is possessed by the

Spirit of God, and feels all heaven within him, he may use the language of his childhood about the gold and jewels of heaven's streets, and the winged messengers of the King; but assuredly his faith is not childish or materialistic.'

But is there any evidence that the disciples did not use the common apocalyptic language in the common sense? There is the evidence of result. By their fruits ye shall know them. We know the apocalyptic type of religion. It is a real type. It exists. 'Its normal results,' says Professor INGE, 'are either political insurgence or selfish quietism—in either case indifference to social morality, neglect of duties, nervous excitement, and rapid evanescence.' Is this the religion of the follower of Christ? Is it the religion of Christ Himself?

But when Professor INGE has vindicated the spiritual character of the religion of Christ and His disciples, he proceeds at once to admit that in the teaching of Christ and in the teaching of His disciples there are passages which are purely apocalyptic in character. And he admits that

their apocalyptic character is not in the language merely, but in the thought. His explanation is to cut the knot. These passages are misinterpretations of Christ's actual teaching on the part of His disciples, or they are later interpolations. 'Very few critics,' he says, 'accept as authentic the apocalyptic prophecy in Mk 13: may there not be one or two more innocent interpolations of the same kind?'

This is a little disappointing. But the truth is better than our pleasure. If it is so, let us see that it is so. It is still more disappointing, perhaps, to find Professor INGE admitting 'the further possibility that our Lord in becoming man may have been willing to share, to some extent, the current popular delusions both with regard to the Messianic hope and to demoniacal possession.' But he insists that this concession must certainly not be stretched so far as to admit that He fancied Himself filling the rôle of Daniel's 'son of man' in the near future. 'Such a notion would not be compatible with sanity, far less with those attributes which all Christians believe Him to have possessed.'

The Alleged Catholicism of the First Gospel and its Date.

BY THE VEN. WILLOUGHBY C. ALLEN, M.A., LECTURER IN THE HISTORY OF DOCTRINE IN THE UNIVERSITY, AND ARCHDEACON OF MANCHESTER.

It seems to be universally believed that the First Gospel reflects a fairly advanced stage of ecclesiastical development. And it is in consequence as universally believed to be comparatively late in date. Professor Peake, *e.g.*, argues against some who date it not much later than the year 70 A.D., 'that the Gospel seems to reflect a somewhat later period of ecclesiastical development. Nothing forbids the view that this rather Catholicised Gospel may have been written towards the close of the first century.'¹ Now, that the book does

represent a certain stage of Church development is certain. What is uncertain is the date to which the Gospel must be assigned in consequence. The Church may be said to have begun its career from the moment that the disciples realized that their Master had left them to preach the gospel. At what stage in its future development must our First Gospel be placed?

I propose to state in the following pages the evidence which seems to me to make it abundantly clear that the book cannot have been written after the Fall of Jerusalem, and that it may have been

¹ *Critical Introduction to the New Testament*, p. 123.

written some years earlier. The question is an important one; indeed, I believe it to be the most important point at issue in the whole so-called Synoptic Problem. It affects our conceptions as to the character of Christ's teaching, the Q question, and perhaps the date of the Second Gospel.

1. The conception, which dominates the whole book, of the kingdom of the heavens as a kingdom to be inaugurated in the *near* future when the Son of Man returns on the clouds of heaven, suggests an early rather than a late date. In St. Paul's later Epistles, in St. Luke and St. John (Gospel), this emphasis on the *nearness* of Christ's coming has been lost, and other conceptions have taken its place of honour.¹ But in the First Gospel the thought of *immediacy* clothes the whole book like an atmosphere. It is to be the burden of the Apostolic preaching (10⁷). And the preachers will not have gone through the cities of Israel ere the Son of Man had come (10²³). The author is so full of it that he reads it into his Marcan source; e.g. 'the kingdom of God come with power' becomes 'the Son of Man coming in his kingdom' (Mt 16²⁸). That 'coming' is coincident with 'the end of the age' (24⁸); and both will take place immediately after the fall of Jerusalem (24²⁹), and within the lifetime of that generation (24³⁴). The high priest and his colleagues were to see the Son of Man coming upon the clouds of heaven (26⁶⁴).

Now the modern reader is strangely blind to this apocalyptic keynote of the First Gospel. This is probably due to many causes, perhaps most of all to an unwillingness to believe that Christ taught what is here put into His mouth. But the immediate question is not, 'Is there here a right and impartial reflexion of Christ's teaching?' but 'Did the Evangelist so conceive Christ's teaching

or not?' To this there can surely be but one answer. The Evangelist lived in the hope that Christ would speedily inaugurate His kingdom, and if words have any meaning at all he thought that the Lord had promised to return on the clouds of heaven in order to effect this inauguration.

It may, however, be said, 'Is there not much teaching in the Gospel in which a longer perspective of history is, if not plainly portrayed, at least visible in the background of thought?' The teaching here referred to is—(a) the reference to a preaching to the Gentiles; (b) the parables; (c) the teaching which implies as a background the community of Christ's disciples as a distinct society obeying Christ's law.

I will deal with the Gentile question and the teaching to the community later on. As regards the parables, it is quite true that some of them might reasonably be so interpreted as to give an impression of the kingdom as a present factor in the world, destined to endure for an indefinite period. So, e.g., the Tares and the Wheat, or the Mustard Seed. But a little reflexion will show that any idea of duration of time which they suggest is purely relative, and that the kingdom, so far as these parables taken by themselves are concerned, is or may be almost anything that the reader chooses to make it, from the Catholic Church to the doctrine of Christ's imminent Parousia. It is of course possible that the Gospel consists of a number of sayings apparently contradictory in tenor, which the Evangelist did not know how to reconcile, but which he recorded simply because they were traditional sayings. But this is very unlikely, because the Evangelist in all probability has made only a selection out of the material available to him, and might have avoided ambiguous sayings or teachings contradictory to others which he was recording, of which the meaning is clear. The simplest and most reasonable view of the Evangelist is that he had certain tolerably clear conceptions of the meaning of Christ's life and teaching, and has selected material to illustrate those conceptions. If that be the case, a readiness to interpret 'the kingdom' of the parables in the light of 'the kingdom' elsewhere in the Gospels ascribes to the Evangelist some reasonable consistency and clearness of view, and relieves the Gospel of the reproach of being a kind of commonplace book of unassorted and inconsistent sayings. But if the kingdom of the parables be the

¹ Dr. Stanton, *Gospels as Historical Documents*, ii. 367, argues that the language of Mt 24 need not cause us to date the Gospel before the year 70 A.D., on the ground that the author can quite well have left unaltered expressions of his source. But this misses the whole point. Not only does the Evangelist leave unaltered expressions of the sources which he had before him for ch. 24, but he does alter, e.g., Mk 9¹ (cf. Mt 16²⁸), in order to bring into that passage the same idea of the nearness of the Parousia, which runs through the whole Gospel. In other words, it is not only the author of the discourse source, but also the Evangelist himself who wishes to teach that idea. Now, considering that in this Gospel the Fall of Jerusalem and the Parousia are closely connected, it is very difficult to suppose that the writer composed the book long after, if at all after, the Fall of the city.

kingdom of the rest of the Gospel, it is clear that in them as elsewhere the kingdom is conceived of as relatively near, within, that is to say, the lifetime of Christ's disciples.

2. If the conception of the kingdom is an early one, so too is the conception of the Church. It is very astonishing and not very creditable to modern criticism that of a book which is permeated from beginning to end with Jewish particularism, modern scholars, because they twice find in it the term 'ecclesia,' should say, 'Lo, the Catholic Church, this book must be very late!' And yet the uncatholic or rather pre-catholic conception of the writer shows itself everywhere.

The disciples of the Messiah are to keep the Law. Not one of the least of its commandments was to be superseded (5^{18, 19}). The 'righteousness' which they were to aim at was to be not less than that of the Scribes and Pharisees, but more; that is to say, more profound because it was based upon a deeper understanding of the intention of the Old Testament (5²¹⁻⁴⁸). But all the commandments of the law were still in force. The Evangelist makes this very clear by thrusting into Mk 10¹⁻¹² a saying reaffirming the sanction of divorce which was traditionally based on Dt 24¹⁻², and by changing the import of Mk 7¹⁴⁻²³, first, by omitting the words *καθαρίζων πάντα τὰ βρώματα*; and secondly, by adding words which suggest that Christ's teaching in this section of Mark have nothing to do with removing the Mosaic distinctions between meats clean and unclean, but rather are concerned with the Rabbinical doctrines of purification (Mt 15²⁰). The Deuteronomic law of the two witnesses is still in force (18¹⁶), so too is the law of the Sabbath (24²⁰).

Of course it follows that in the mind of the Evangelist 'the disciples of the Messiah must be Jews or proselytes. And here we come to the attitude of the Gospel to Gentiles. Nothing can be clearer. The Messiah Himself had set an example here. When a Canaanite woman had come to Him from heathen territory and begged His aid, He had told her that His mission was not to Gentiles, but to the house of Israel (15²⁴⁻²⁶). And in accordance with this He had expressly bidden His disciples go neither to Samaritan nor Gentile (10^{5, 6}), but rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. Of course such teaching did not prevent a heathen from joining the community of Christ's disciples, if he were willing to keep the

law. Had not Gentiles always been welcomed to Judaism on such terms? And the disciples of the Messiah now represented the true Judaism. This community of law-keeping disciples of the Messiah are separated from the mass of the Jewish people, and especially from the Scribes and Pharisees who persecute them by (a) their belief in the Messiah, (b) their truer insight into the Law, (c) their belief in the coming kingdom. Consequently they form what the Pharisees would have described as a sect, but what they themselves regarded as the true kernel of the Jewish nation. The Jewish authorities by their attitude to the Messiah had disinherited themselves. They were the 'sons of the kingdom,' i.e. those who ought to have inherited it; but they would be cast out (8¹²). The disciples of the Messiah now remained as the 'sons of the kingdom' (13³⁸).

And separated as they were by their Messianic views from the mass of their compatriots, Christ's disciples had their own simple organization. They regarded the twelve Apostles as their rulers. In the coming kingdom these twelve should sit on twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel (10²³). For the other leaders of their simple organization they retained Old Testament or current Jewish terms: they were prophets or wise men or scribes (23³⁴ 13⁵²). Of course they regarded themselves as a community or society. What Aramaic term they used we do not know. Probably there were several. 'Israel' may have been one, 'synagogue' perhaps was another, God's 'nation' (21⁴³) may have been a third. The writer of the First Gospel twice speaks of an 'ecclesia.' Writing in Greek he could hardly have done anything else. In the second passage (18¹⁷) he quite clearly means whatever local body of Christians the offended party belonged to. In the first (16¹⁸) he no doubt has in mind the whole body of the Messiah's disciples. From the moment of the resurrection to the day when Christ's disciples began to regard themselves as a community or society or body or corporation separated from their fellow-countrymen by their Messianic beliefs need not have been a long period. The first definite acts of persecution at Jerusalem would mark the change. And whether for a local group of Christians, or for the several groups regarded as one body in relation to the Messiah, *ecclesia* was for one who wrote in Greek the only natural term, as St. Paul's Epistles amply testify.

But are there not passages in the Gospel which show that the writer, in spite of all that has been brought forward, is a Catholic Christian for whom the strife about the admission of Gentiles into the Church is already a thing of the past?

And here I would urge as a reasonable proviso, that if there be isolated passages of doubtful purport they ought to be interpreted in accordance with the general line of thought running through the Gospel, and not unnecessarily be so interpreted as to give a meaning which will introduce chaos of thought into the book. There is, in the first place, the saying 8^{11, 12} which the author has placed in the story of the centurion's servant. The 'sons of the kingdom,' i.e. the official Jews are to be excluded from the kingdom, whilst many are to come from east and west and sit down with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of the heavens. The modern commentator jumps to the conclusion that, by the many, Gentiles are intended, and this is possible. The centurion is regarded as a type of a large class who will enter into the kingdom, whilst those who ought to have inherited it, or who regarded themselves as its rightful inheritors, will be thrust out. But there is nothing here inconsistent with the main idea of the Gospel that the kingdom is destined for the true disciples of the Messiah, who must be law-abiding people. The strictest Pharisee never found himself able to exclude Gentiles from the privileges of Judaism. And the Old Testament, the charter of Pharisaism, is full of passages which foretell the inclusion of Gentiles in the privileges of Judaism. It is perfectly clear that the strictest Jewish Christian might be whole-heartedly opposed to the Pauline policy, and yet might accept these words of the Messiah without any misgiving. The 'many from east and west' would not trouble him. If he thought of Gentiles, he would interpret at once as proselytes, or think of Jews of the Dispersion as opposed to the spiritually blinded official classes at Jerusalem. The main point was that they were to sit with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom; and a kingdom with the Jewish Messiah as its king and the Patriarchs as its leading citizens could cause no misgiving to the most sensitive Jewish Christian.

Another and more difficult passage is Mt 21⁴³, where it is said that the kingdom of God will be taken from the chief priests and elders (cf. v. 23), and given to a nation (*ἐθνει*) which produces its

fruits. This verse is inserted by the author as a sort of commentary on Mk 12⁹, where it is said that the vineyard will be given to others (*ἄλλοις*). It is, in the first place, clear that by *ἐθνει* the author is not thinking of the Gentiles primarily, or he would not have used the singular. The contrast is not between the Jews as a race and the Gentiles as another race, but between the Jewish authorities who have forfeited their right to be called God's vineyard or true Israel, and those people who being the true disciples of the Messiah are really His people. *ἔθνος* here, therefore, denotes spiritual quality, not racial privilege. And, if Gentiles are not excluded, they are not in the mind of the writer as included. If he had been asked who formed this *ἔθνος*, he would no doubt have answered all who were disciples of the Messiah and kept the Law and looked for the kingdom.

There remain two passages, and only two, where the Catholicism of the author will seem to the average reader clear and speaking. Let it be said once again, that we are not now concerned with the original meaning of these words, nor with their meaning as interpreted by us in the light of history, but with the probable interpretation put upon them by the author of the First Gospel when he incorporated them into his book. The author, as we have seen, was one who believed that the Messiah had reaffirmed the claims of the Mosaic Law upon all His disciples. Could one who so believed have written these words?

The first is Mt 24¹⁴, 'This gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in the whole world for a testimony among all nations.' The author is borrowing from Mk 13¹⁰, but he finds it necessary to qualify St. Mark's words. 'The gospel' becomes 'this gospel of the kingdom'; 'to all nations' becomes 'among all nations'; and the important qualification 'for a testimony' is added. Now it is clear that the author supposed that this preaching 'for a testimony' could be accomplished within a generation (cf. 16²⁸ 24³⁴). What he meant by 'for a testimony' remains obscure, but it will be in harmony with the entire scheme of his gospel if we suppose him to be thinking of the Jews of the Diaspora. Amongst all such 'the gospel of the kingdom' must be preached, that they and any Gentiles who would keep the Law might have opportunity of enrolling themselves as disciples of the true Messiah and waiting for His kingdom. But whatever 'amongst all nations for

a testimony' may mean, the key to the whole verse clearly lies in the words 'this gospel of the kingdom.' Now, in the light of the whole book, that phrase can mean nothing but the 'gospel of the kingdom as expounded in this book,' *i.e.* 'the good news of the coming back of the Messiah upon the clouds of heaven to inaugurate a kingdom into which all His disciples shall enter.' And, as we have seen, His disciples are they who keep the Law as the Messiah bade them.

And the remaining passage is 28¹⁹, 'make disciples of all nations,' *μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη*. There is nothing necessarily Catholic in the later sense of the word here. The Pharisees had always regarded it as a duty, if not a privilege, to make disciples of all nations. 'They compassed,' says this Gospel, 'heaven and earth to make one proselyte.' 'Raise up many disciples,' say the men of the great synagogue, in the *Sayings of the Jewish Fathers*. 'Love mankind,' says Hillel in the same book, 'and bring them nigh to the Torah.' It all depends, of course, upon the meaning we put into *μαθητεύσατε*. What I am concerned with here is the fact that the strictest member of the Jewish Christian party might have believed the words to have been uttered by the Messiah, and yet have fought hard against the Pauline heresy of introducing uncircumcised Gentiles into the new Israel.

I have tried to show that if we do not insist on forcing Catholic meanings into some of the words of the First Gospel against the general tenor and meaning of the writer, there is no Catholicism there. On the other hand, the doctrine of the immediacy of the kingdom throws the book back into the period before the Fall of Jerusalem, whilst the author's view of the permanent validity of the Law, and the consequently narrowed scope of Christianity would admirably fit in with a date about (shortly before or after) the Council at Jerusalem.

Let me now throw out some provisional and conjectural suggestions as to the date and provenance of the book. It is possible that it was written (*c.* 50) at Antioch by some one who agreed with the views referred to in Ac 15¹. In favour of Antioch rather than Jerusalem is the fact that the Gospel is written in Greek, not in Aramaic or Hebrew, and that it is based upon a Greek St. Mark. The doctrine of the kingdom, the doctrine of the Law, the attitude towards the Gentile world,

all seem to favour such a date; and the fact that the writer is a Jew, probably a Hellenist Jew, writing in Greek, and using Greek sources, including the Septuagint version, favours the place. We might then regard the Gospel as the strongest case that could be made out of Gospel material for the Jewish Christian position. It was impossible to show that the Messiah had commanded that all Gentiles should be circumcised, but it was possible to show that He had laid upon all His disciples as a necessary obligation the observance of the law. And it was possible to show that He had by example and precept deprecated the breaking down of barriers between Jews and pagans (15²⁴ and 7⁶), where it is probable that 'dogs and swine' are for the Evangelist equivalent to Gentiles.

But it will be said, 'Is not the relationship between the First and Second Gospels decisive against so early a date?' I feel much hesitation upon this point, but I think that the answer should be a cautious No. I have long felt that the tradition which points to Rome as the home of the Second Gospel, and which suggests, therefore, a date later than 60 A.D. for the Second Gospel, may be justified by some final revision of the Gospel at Rome after that date, but cannot explain the first publication of the Gospel. For myself I believe in an ultimate Aramaic original, and I see no reason why such an original should not have appeared before the year 50 A.D. The Gospel might well first have appeared in Greek about that period, and then have been used by the author of the First Gospel.

Another objection to so early a date for St. Matthew is urged by Dr. Stanton, *The Gospels as Historical Documents*, ii. p. 368. He argues that St. Luke's Gospel must be dated *c.* 80 A.D., and that the First Gospel cannot have been written more than a few years before that date, because St. Luke must have known of it soon after its publication, and could not have avoided using it. I must not here enter into the date of St. Luke's Gospel. Let us allow that it was written *c.* 80 A.D. St. Luke, then, it is argued, must have known of the First Gospel, and must have used it. Both statements seem to me to be too dogmatic, but I think it probable that both are true. But in view of the Jewish-Christian character of the First Gospel, who can wonder if St. Luke, the Pauline Universalist, having read it, laid it aside among the many other

Gospel narratives that he had read. St. Luke had much to record. He certainly did not wish to repeat the anti-Jewish polemic which occupies so large a place in the First Gospel, and he already had in other forms most of the Lord's sayings which are in the First Gospel and which were adapted to the purpose of his own work.

It may be noted that Harnack seems inclined to

reopen the question of the date of the Lucan writings and of St. Mark. See his *Acts of the Apostles*, pp. 294 and 296. I think it probable that critical opinion will shortly move in the direction of, say, 60 A.D., as suggested by Harnack, for the Third Gospel, and 50 A.D., or shortly before, for the first publication of a Greek Second Gospel.

Harnack on the Recently Discovered Odes of Solomon.¹

BY THE REV. H. A. A. KENNEDY, M.A., D.Sc., D.D., PROFESSOR OF
EXEGETICAL THEOLOGY IN THE NEW COLLEGE, EDINBURGH.

IT is not many months since Dr. Rendel Harris published the *editio princeps* of the Odes of Solomon which he was fortunate enough to discover in a late Syriac MS. from the neighbourhood of the Tigris. A perusal of the book was bound to convince scholars that a remarkable addition had been made to ancient religious literature. And now Professor Harnack, speaking with unrivalled knowledge of the facts, declares that since the discovery of the *Didache*, thirty years ago, nothing so valuable as this has come to light (p. v). The *editio princeps*, it need scarcely be said, was an admirable piece of work, but it was inevitable that further study of the Syriac text would elucidate difficulties both of translation and of interpretation. Such is unquestionably the result of the new edition. Flemming's translation has brought clearness into many obscure places, and, in our judgment, Harnack has made as important a contribution towards the true estimate and explanation of the Odes, as that which he gave to the world many years ago in his classical edition of the *Didache*.

The absence of historical allusions in the Odes makes the question of the date a difficult one. But two or three facts are clear. A quotation from Ode 19 in Lactantius and the presence of five of the Odes in the *Pistis Sophia* make it evident that they were regarded as canonical considerably before the middle of the third century.

¹ *Ein Jüdisch-Christliches Psalmbuch aus dem ersten Jahrhundert.* Aus dem Syrischen übersetzt von J. Flemming. Bearbeitet u. herausgegeben von Adolf Harnack. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1910. Pp. vi, 134.

That would push back their origin, at latest, to the middle of the second century. But an allusion in Ode 4 to the Temple, in which reference is also made to a rival sanctuary (perhaps several?), justifies Harnack in assuming that the Temple was still standing when the Ode was written. This seems more probable than the suggestion of Rendel Harris that it was the destruction of the rival Temple of Onias at Leontopolis in Egypt, in 73 A.D., which called forth the protest of the fourth Ode. Accordingly, the *terminus ad quem* must be placed somewhere before 70 A.D. On the other hand, according to the *Pistis Sophia*, the *Synopsis Sanctae Scripturae* of Pseudo-Athanasius (cent. 6), the *Stichometry* of Nicephorus (cent. 9), and Harris's Syriac MS., the Odes formed one book with the famous Psalms of Solomon, which are placed before them by all but the last-named authority. We know that the *Psalms* of Solomon belong to the time of the Roman invasion of Judæa under Pompey. Hence, the *terminus a quo* for the Odes is probably about 50 B.C. It is universally agreed that the Psalms of Solomon are products of Palestinian Judaism. This, at least, raises the presumption that the Odes, which have been combined with them to form a single collection, are of Jewish and Palestinian origin also.

At this point there emerges an important difference of opinion between the two editors. Rendel Harris holds that 'the writer, while not a Jew, was a member of a community of Christians, who were for the most part of Jewish extraction and beliefs, and the apologetic tone which is displayed in the

Odes towards the Gentiles, as a part of the Christian Church, is only consistent with the very earliest ages, and with communities like the Palestinian Churches where Judaism was still in evidence and in control' (p. 87). It is plain to every reader that the Odes, as they stand, contain distinctly Christian elements. Reference is made to the Son, to the Incarnation, to the Virgin-Birth, to the Cross, to the *Descensus ad inferos*. But a careful examination shows that several of the Odes (notably 4 and 6) are certainly Jewish. A second large group reveals no essentially Christian features. How are the facts to be accounted for? Harnack, with real insight, as it appears to us, argues for the hypothesis that the original collection of Odes was purely Jewish, and that it was worked over by a Christian interpolator, who introduced Christian references and terms of thought, but in such a fashion that the insertions, as a rule, can be more or less plainly detected. His acute investigation of Ode 7 is an excellent illustration of how the interpolations may be removed from the text without seriously affecting the progress of the thought. Indeed, again and again, it is this operation alone which makes the context intelligible. But he frankly admits that Odes 19 and 27 are purely Christian, probably the work of the interpolator, although he is not certain that all the Christian elements spring from one source (p. 118).

Harnack's hypothesis is not a mere daring speculation, but one which is supported by a very remarkable parallel in the literature of later Judaism. The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs present the same phenomena. Here also a fundamentally Jewish work has been revised and Christianized in parts by a Christian interpolator. In both cases the interpolations are sometimes obscure, because they are clothed essentially in the style of the original (p. 77). But not only does the *form* of the *Testaments* afford a striking parallel to the Odes, but also the character of their thought. The Odes reveal a more fully developed phase of a strain of religious thought in later Judaism, whose earlier stages may be traced in the Testaments. Harnack, from this standpoint, would place them between the *Wisdom of Solomon* and the *Johannine* literature. We must dwell for a little on this point. The Odes, and in a lesser degree the Testaments, do not belong to the main stream of Jewish religion. They embody a sort of

mystic individualism. And this character belongs not only to the Jewish original, but to the Christian revision. That is to say, there are marked affinities between the piety of the reviser and that of the circle or author (Harnack, like Harris, inclines, on the whole, to one main source) from whom the Odes have come. 'There speaks in them a mystic, who sees his Ego redeemed . . . and raised to the eternal through the revelation and knowledge of God and by means of the most intimate relationship of love towards Him, a man also who feels that it is his function, as a messenger of God, to communicate to others that which he has experienced' (p. 86). Harnack makes a most impressive collection of characteristic features from the Odes which sets in clear light the religious individuality of the Psalmist (p. 91 f.). He finds the keynote of his thought in such an utterance as that of Ode 26. 10: 'Who may so rest in the Highest, as to speak directly out of His mouth?' (p. 59). Harnack justly discovers foreshadowings of the singer's religious attitude in some of the Canonical Psalms (p. 92). In view of these, it is surely an exaggeration to say (in an important note denying the existence of Gnostic elements in the Odes, p. 103) that this real participation in the being of God through union with Him is not 'a deduction drawn from the ordinary Jewish religion, but springs from foreign influences.' Of course everything here turns on the precise meaning of 'the ordinary Jewish religion,' but the intimate fellowship with God which finds expression in many of the Psalms is surely at least a legitimate development in the light of experience of prominent elements in the religion of the Prophets. When we examine the remarkable expressions of the religious self-consciousness of this 'mystic prophet' in the Odes, we are not surprised that a Christian of later date (Harnack argues for 'about 100 A.D.') should have interpreted them in a Christian (Messianic) sense, and inserted additions to emphasize that interpretation.

Of quite peculiar interest are the leading conceptions of the Odes in their original form. Among them occur χάρις, πιστεύειν, γνώσις, ἀλήθεια, φῶς, ὕδωρ ζωῆς, ἀγάπη, ζωή, of course in a Syriac dress (although Harnack gives reasons for holding that they go back, through a Greek translation, to a Hebrew or Aramaic original, p. 105). Here we are at once reminded of the Johannine writings.

Rendel Harris has discussed the connexion briefly (pp. 73, 74), and sums up with the statement: 'I think it will be conceded that we are in a Johannine atmosphere.' Harnack deliberately asserts that in the Odes we come upon 'the presuppositions of the piety and theology of John . . . apart from any Messianic doctrine' (p. 99). The importance of the phenomenon is that in these writings we are confronted by a type of Jewish religion which stands apart from Hellenic speculation, and yet flows into the same channel as that of Greek philosophy. In the one case, 'everything depends on the ordering of God, in the other on the nature of spirit.' 'Here,' as Harnack most suggestively observes, 'it is true, as in the case of many linguistic phenomena of the Hellenistic period, that there are Hellenisms which are also Semitisms' (p. 100). In these words there is opened up a vista of far-reaching discussion. Harnack declines to dogmatize on the circle to which this author belongs. But he ventures to say that 'John, before he became a Christian, may have been a Jewish mystic like the author of our Odes. To him he is most closely related. They possibly

spring from one circle' (p. 106). Now, in a sense, the Christian interpolator has attempted to do what John actually did, to bring this remarkable mystical individualism into direct connexion with Christ. But his attempt was mechanical. 'John has fused the Synoptic Christ with this religion of Light, Love, and Life, and placed its basis in Him' (pp. 99, 100). Harnack has carefully examined the Christology of the interpolator, and regards it as belonging to the main stream of Christological development in the Church, having nothing essentially Jewish-Christian or Gnostic about it, closely connected with Palestinian soil, and scarcely to be placed later than the end of the first century. Its type 'is closely akin to the Johannine; indeed, one must ask whether he did not know the Gospel of John. In the light of Ode 41, that is for me highly probable. I merely hesitate to affirm that it is certain' (p. 110).

Enough has been said to indicate the profound interest and importance of Harnack's discussion. We have not referred to the very valuable detailed commentary on the Odes, which no student of them can afford to neglect.

Literature.

THE NEW SCHAFF-HERZOG.

THE sixth and seventh volumes have now been issued of *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge* (Funk & Wagnalls; 21s. net each). They contain respectively 505 and 502 pages in double column. And as each column contains an average of nearly 500 words, each volume contains about 500,000 words. It means much writing and much editing, and it is well worth the guinea charged for it.

Still it is not so good as the *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*, each volume of which contains about 1,250,000 words.

After a short account of the Inquisition, with a good bibliography, the first article of importance in the sixth volume is that on 'Inscriptions.' It is condensed from Dr. N. Müller's article in the German edition. Again the bibliography is good so far as it goes, but it has not been brought

up to date. The late Dr. H. Cremer's article on 'Inspiration,' after abridgment, has been supplemented by Professor David S. Schaff and Professor C. A. Beckwith. Then comes the first article of the kind for which the Encyclopedia is likely to be most frequently referred to—an article on the German sect called 'The Inspired.' It is curiously out of proportion to the greater topics round it, but we rejoice in its length and interest. The article on the 'Intermediate State' is only a column in length, with references to Eschatology, Probation, and Future. Then comes an article on 'Interpolations in the New Testament' which could have been saved, a cross-reference being made to the article on the text. After a little we come to the article on 'Isaiah,' which is signed by Professor James A. Kelso.

And this article reveals at once the strength and the weakness of the book. For the articles on Bible topics are generally well done and of con-

siderable length; but how easily and how gladly could we have spared them all in order that space might be found for a fuller treatment of topics belonging to the Church. A Dictionary of the Bible is in every one's hands now, and with articles of greater fulness and authority than it is possible for those in this Encyclopædia to possess. If a Dictionary of the Bible had been taken for granted, and the whole space in these twelve volumes used for the history of the Church subsequent to the close of the Canon, how great would have been the value of this Encyclopædia.

The article on 'Jesus Christ' is in two parts. The first half has been written by Professor Warfield of Princeton, the second half by Professor B. W. Bacon of Yale. Professor Bacon is one of the most conscientious scholars of our day. His critical position is an advanced one. This is what he says of the Transfiguration: 'Parallel to this prose statement is the apocalypse or "vision" story of the Transfiguration, interjected by Mark in 9²⁻¹⁰ from some Pauline source of the symbolic type represented in John. Jesus was "metamorphosed" (cf. 2 Cor 3¹⁸) before the eyes of Peter, James, and John into his glorified form, while the translated "witnesses of Messiah," Moses and Elias, stood beside him. The voice of God then declared his true character. This again, it need hardly be said, belongs to the history of Christological doctrine; not to the story of Jesus.' Professor Bacon ends his article with the crucifixion. There is one short paragraph after the words, 'Friendly but unknown hands accorded him hasty burial.' This is the paragraph:

'Such is the career whose outline critical analysis dimly discerns beneath the tradition of the Church. The vindication came, though not as Jesus expected it. The throne to which he had not aspired was given him by the love and faith of humanity. There was a "turning again" when the influence of Jesus, whether by the reaction of memories of the past, or in direct spiritual intervention from the unseen world, reawakened the faith of Simon Peter and Christianity began, founded in devotion to the risen and glorified Lord.'

In the seventh volume one of the most satisfactory articles goes under the title of 'Lutherans.' A large proportion of the volume is occupied with personal names, as it covers most of the letter M. It begins the second half of the whole work, and brings the alphabet down to 'Moralists.'

HUNGARY.

In 1878 the Hungarian Academy of Science invited Professor Henry Marczali of Budapest to write a History of Hungary in the time of Joseph II. and Leopold II. (1780-1792). He accepted the invitation, and resolved to make the work as reliable as thorough investigation and sincere desire to keep clear of prejudice could make it. The first edition appeared in 1882, and was immediately succeeded by a second. An edition in English has now been published, made from the Hungarian by Professor A. B. Yolland of Budapest. The work covers only the twelve years named, but the English edition contains an introductory essay on the 'Earlier History of Hungary,' which enables the publishers to give the book the title of *Hungary in the Eighteenth Century* (Cambridge University Press; 7s. 6d. net). The introduction is written by Mr. Harold W. V. Temperley, M.A., Fellow of Peterhouse.

It is quite likely that this introductory essay will be to many Englishmen the opening into a fresh field of study. For Hungary is not well known among us. It is farther away than China or Japan. And it will be a surprise to find that the history of Hungary is after all so human and near. It will be a further surprise to learn that some of the great problems of history were of necessity faced in Hungary, and can be seen there in clear significance, not without the presence of sacrifice and tragedy. There is, above all, the great problem of how an uncivilized nation is to adopt civilization and not lose its own nationality. This problem was the great fascination which drew Professor Marczali to the study of his native land in the period assigned him, and carried him through all his laborious preparation. And this is the problem which gives world-wide interest to his work.

We see the reality of the conflict most clearly when we come to the chapter on the Church. 'For several centuries,' says Professor Marczali, 'the distinction between the two conflicting religions which had the greatest political importance and the deepest consequences was that the Catholics clung to the dynasty, which remained true to the old faith. Since the Protestants considered that this alliance imperilled their political and religious liberty, the latter party looked rather to the Turks for support. They were just as little desirous of Osmanizing Hungary as the Catholics

were of Germanizing it, and their situation is, after all, best explained by their relations to the Emperor and the Sultan. Consequently (though the statement may seem open to question), while a large part of the nation professed the Protestant faith, and by its energetic opposition saved the constitution and, perhaps, the nationality of Hungary, none the less the influence of the Catholic Church harmonized more with the historic development of the nation. The most glorious traditions of her past called upon Hungary to fight against the infidels, for she had won her place in the history of the world by such struggles in the past. Everywhere else, indeed, it was natural and almost necessary that the interests of the weaker Protestantism should be identified with those of Islam, the foe of Christianity; but in Hungary the alliance with the Turks at a time of constitutional and religious struggle involved a denial of the nation's past and future. It is this fact that accounts for the tragic fate of men like Bocskay and Gabriel Bethlen, who were the leaders not only of their party but of their nation; they could achieve victories, excite enthusiasm, and command devotion, but they were never able to revive the whole energy of the national spirit.'

But the pursuit of the subject would carry us too far. It is enough to add that the book is one of the utmost scientific value, and that the translation is one of no less artistic value.

A NEW SHAKESPEAREAN DICTIONARY.

The best commentary on Shakespeare was written by a German—Gervinus. The best dictionary of the language of Shakespeare was also written by a German—Schmidt.

We ought to be ashamed of ourselves. It is not that we have not men who are fit to write commentaries and compile dictionaries. It seems to be that we have not people enough to buy them. A man must give his lifetime to such a work, and no publisher can guarantee that his life's work will not be wasted.

But after Schmidt comes Cunliffe. Mr. R. J. Cunliffe has prepared *A New Shakespearean Dictionary* (Blackie & Son; 9s. net). It is in one volume to Schmidt's two. That seems the utmost that we can attain to. But it is a work of first-rate ability, superseding Schmidt in everything except

the examples. Mr. Cunliffe has had the use, for a large part of the alphabet, of the *Oxford English Dictionary*, and the advantage of other books issued since Schmidt appeared, especially Bartlett's *Concordance*. And he has made excellent use of all his materials.

What is a Shakespearean Dictionary? It is a dictionary of all the words that are used by Shakespeare in a sense that is obsolete or not quite obvious. Some of the words are actually out of use. But it is not for them that a dictionary of Shakespeare is most necessary. It is for words that have slightly changed their meaning. Many of them make good sense in the modern meaning, and then the dictionary is most necessary of all. Mr. Cunliffe gives some examples: 'travelling *along* this coast'; 'last scene of all, That ends this strange eventful *history*'; 'they are *generally* fools and cowards.' All the words in these examples are quite familiar. They seem, taken as a modern writer would use them, to give a good sense. Unless he is on his guard, the reader is likely to take this as the true sense. But if the words in italics are turned up in the dictionary it will be seen that the sense which the author intended to convey is very different.

It is a delightful book to read. Take the word *occupy* by chance. It occurs ten times in the Authorized Version. In Shakespeare it occurs but twice. For it had come to be employed by vulgar people in a nasty sense, and Shakespeare could not use it, of which, indeed, he makes complaint. Dr. Murray tells us that outside the Bible he has found only eight quotations for the word throughout the seventeenth century, though he found 194 quotations for the sixteenth century. Why has the Authorized Version as many as ten examples? It is partly because the Authorized Version was the heir of the Versions that went before it. But not entirely; for, once at least, it takes the word from Cranmer, though it had not been used by Tindale. Probably the translators of the Authorized Version were not so familiar with the word in its objectionable sense as Shakespeare was.

Do revivals come before they are wanted? The wind bloweth where it listeth. And yet it is subject to law. He maketh the winds His messengers, and He is a God of order. Revivals do not come

before they are wanted. I would, but ye would not.

Do revivals come when they are wanted? That is another matter. But if they are wanted earnestly enough, if they are wanted persistently enough, in the way of giving Him no rest? And then when they come the result is so unexpected and overwhelming that they are felt to be a fulfilment of the promise, 'Before they call I will answer, and while they are yet speaking I will hear.' There are men in Scotland who are praying for a revival of religion now, praying earnestly and persistently. And some of them think they already hear the sound of a going in the tops of the mulberry trees. They are recalling the last great revival just fifty years ago. They have published a volume entitled *Reminiscences of the Revival of '59 and the Sixties* (Aberdeen: The University Press; 2s.; paper covers, 1s. 3d.). It is a book to be read. Not for the human side of it, as if the same men must come again with the same figures of speech; but for the Divine side of it, to encourage faith that the same God will come again with the same mighty power to save. Yet on the human side it is full of interest. There are many portraits. They are portraits of large, powerful Scotchmen. Who could have supposed them capable of so much emotion and self-forgetfulness?

Here is a scene, and a comment on it, taken from a new life of *Lancelot Andrewes* (George Allen; 3s. 6d. net), written by Mr. Douglas Maclean, M.A. Better than any words of a reviewer, it will convey an impression of the author's attitude and experience. With the quotation it will be enough to say that Mr. Maclean has made himself thoroughly familiar with Andrewes' time as well as Andrewes' temper. And he is able to make his knowledge ours.

'It was in such a hotbed of controversial factiousness that Andrewes spent seventeen years of his early manhood. What were his own leanings? He had been brought up at school by a "warm Protestant." At Cambridge he was attracted to the devotional side of Calvinism, and is said to have united with Knewstubs, Chaderton, Culverwell, and others of that way of thinking, in weekly meetings for prayer and expository exercises. Chaderton was the first master of "the pure house of Emmanuel," founded in 1584 by Mildmay, who caused the chapel to be built

north and south, and Ezekiel Culverwell was of the same society. Aubrey has a rather malicious story about its members. He says:

"The Puritan faction did begin to increase in those dayes, and especially at Emanuel College. That party had a great mind to drawe in this learned young man, whom if they could make theirs they knew would be a great honour to them. They carried themselves outwardly with great sanctity and stricknesse. . . . They preached up very strict observing the Lord's Day,—made damnation to breake it. . . . Yet these hypocrites did bowle in a private green at their colledge every Sunday after sermon; and one of their colledge (a loving friend to Mr. L. Andrewes) to satisfie him one time lent him the key of a private back dore to the bowling green, on a Sunday evening, which he opening, discovered these zealous preachers, with their gownes off, earnest at play. But they were strangely surprized to see the entry of one that was not of the brotherhood."

The saints and precisians were giving English folk the spirit of heaviness in lieu of the garment of praise; but I doubt if hypocrisy—which begins with self-sophistication—was as yet a prevailing note of Puritanism. Aubrey was a seventeenth-century royalist and High Churchman. After all, hypocrites do not count. It is the people in earnest who make history, for better or for worse. And all religious movements have an aspect which may be called in the higher sense puritan or evangelical. Certainly Tractarianism had such a side.'

After nearly completing the 'Bible for Schools and Colleges,' the Cambridge Press began a companion series on the 'Revised Version for the Use of Schools.' In this series volumes have been published on the New Testament books from Matthew to Philemon. The first volume of the Old Testament has just appeared. It is *Isaiah, i.-xxxix*. The editors are the Rev. C. H. Thomson, M.A., and the Rev. John Skinner, D.D. (1s. 6d. net).

In the study of this commentary, the thing that most impresses one is the amount of work that has yet to be done in *translating* Isaiah, even after the Revised Version. Take Is 3¹⁶ as an example: R.V., 'The daughters of Zion are haughty, and walk with stretched forth necks and wanton eyes, walking and mincing as they go, and making a tinkling with their feet'; Thomson and Skinner: 'The daughters of Zion are haughty, and walk with stretched forth necks and ogling with their eyes: with tripping steps they walk, and with their feet they make their anklets tingle.'

Besides the notes there is an introduction of thirty-five pages, which might have enriched a Dictionary of the Bible.

The little book is the *multum in parvo* of commenting, and every sentence has been written by a scholar.

The Roman Catholic Church does not seem to be afraid of the historical study of religion. A series of penny pamphlets has been published by the Catholic Truth Society, entitled *C.T.S. Lectures on the History of Religions*. The latest is *The Religion of the Avesta*, by Professor A. Carnoy of the University of Louvain. It is easy reading, and yet altogether trustworthy.

Four-and-twenty years ago, the Rev. John Telford, B.A., published a *Life of John Wesley*. It has been selling all the time. Now he has revised and enlarged it (Culley; 3s. 6d. net), and sent it out as a kind of forerunner of the great life which is coming. Wesley no longer belongs to the Wesleys. The time is at hand when every Englishman will be as familiar with his life as with the life of Samuel Johnson, and every Scotsman as with the life of Scott.

'The Methodists themselves,' said J. R. Green, 'were the least result of the Methodist Revival.' So we may say that Christians are the least result of Christian Missions. We are led to believe it by the reading of a volume entitled *The Kingdom without Frontiers*, by Thomas Moscrop (Culley; 3s. 6d. net). It is a survey of the evangelical missions of the world. It is a book of great comfort and consolation. For the writer believes that if, on the one hand, there are some who, having named the name of Christ, do not depart from iniquity; on the other hand, there are many who through the preaching of the Gospel have conspicuously departed from iniquity without having named the name of Christ. It is a clear case for the application of the text, 'He that is not against us is on our side.'

It is an encouraging book in many ways. Another way is its frank recognition of the fact that we shall not have attained to the fulness of the mind of Christ until we have made room in our Christianity for all that is genuine in the faith of the Hindu, as well as for all that is genuine in the faith of the Hebrew. It is a process, as Mr.

Moscrop says, which some are afraid of, lest the crown should be Christ's no more; but it is a process, as he goes on to say, leading to a stronger and a richer Christian apologetic, which will greatly glorify Christ and crown Him indeed with many crowns.

The new volume of the works of Friedrich Nietzsche in English is the thirteenth. It contains *The Genealogy of Morals* (Foulis; 3s. 6d. net), translated by Mr. Horace B. Samuel, M.A., together with the fragment on 'Peoples and Countries,' translated by Mr. J. M. Kennedy. It is a good volume to begin the study of Nietzsche with; for we suppose he must be studied. Only let no one begin the study too soon. If the study of Job precedes, we shall not be greatly afraid. If the study of Paul's Epistle to the Philippians precedes, we shall have no fear at all. This is one of the easiest of the books to read. The translators have made it easier in the English than in the German.

There is no doubt in the mind of Mrs. Ashley Carus-Wilson, B.A., that the time is come for a great united furtherance of the Kingdom in the world. Her faith is quite reasonable, but it is none the less faith, and none the less likely to beget faith in others. Her book, of which the title is *The Expansion of Christendom* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s.), is in a way a history of Protestant Missions, but it is less than that and more. It is no systematic complete history. Countries and men are left out at will. But then it is informed with a spirit which few histories have—a spirit, as we have said, of faith and reason. And, above all, it is a strong encouragement. Seeing that so much has been done, seeing also that so much has to be done, let us lay hold of the hope set before us in the gospel. If we were to try to put its significance into a sentence, we should say that the book is an expansion of Carey's great saying: 'Do great things; expect great things.'

For nearly twenty years, Samuel G. Smith, D.D., Ph.D., LL.D., Head Professor of the Department of Sociology and Anthropology in the University of Minnesota, has been a teacher of Sociology. During the same time he has been a teacher of the Bible. One day it occurred to him that Sociology and the Bible might be taught together. Until

that day he had taught Sociology to the upper classmen in the University, and the Bible to special classes in connexion with the People's Church of St. Paul. He began to teach them together, to selected companies of students; and then he boldly announced that he would teach 'Biblical Sociology' to his classes in the University. Part of the course thus taught has been published under the title of *Religion in the Making* (Macmillan; 5s. net).

How has it fared with Sociology? It has fared well. Its materials have been taken from the Bible, and they have been varied and abundant. How has it fared with the Bible? It has fared no worse. Hitherto work of this kind has been done by ethnologists chiefly. And when the ethnologist found a custom elsewhere which bore a strong resemblance to something in the Bible, he thought he had rendered the Biblical fact of no special importance. The study of Biblical Sociology has rendered such a Biblical fact of more importance than ever.

But how does it fare with revelation? The Biblical Sociologist is equally opposed to the supernaturalist who holds that all the knowledge and worship in religion came from an active God to a passive man, and to the naturalist who holds that religion is the product of an active man working upon material in his own heart and brain. The Sociologist holds that the revelation of God could never surpass the capacity of the man to whom it came; and yet it was God's gentleness (or reverence, as Professor Smith translates it) that made man great.

Dr. Horace Grant Underwood of Korea was chosen to deliver the fourth course of the Charles F. Deem's Lectures. The previous courses were delivered by Principal Iverach, Professor Bowne, and Principal Fairbairn. The fifth will be delivered by Sir W. M. Ramsay. Dr. Underwood chose as his subject *Religions of Eastern Asia*. The course is now published by Messrs. Macmillan (6s. 6d. net).

The Religions of Eastern Asia are Taoism, Shamanism, Confucianism, and Buddhism, and Dr. Underwood has given a sketch of each of these religions according to the very latest knowledge. The Shamanism he describes is of course the Shamanism of Korea; the Siberian and other varieties have to be taken by themselves. Then, in the last lecture, Dr. Underwood, being a

missionary, brings these forms of religion into direct and detailed comparison with the religion of the Old and New Testament. The conclusion is that the one distinct and unique thing in the Bible is revelation. 'Sooner or later the world will learn that religion is not a creature of civilization, nor of evolution worked out by a gradually developing animal, but a matter of inspiration, "that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God."'

An exceptional number of able men have edited the Epistle to the Hebrews. There are Westcott, Davidson, Vaughan, Bruce, Rendall, Dale, Murray, and more, without touching on the books which have appeared in series. To their number must now be added the Very Rev. E. C. Wickham, D.D., Dean of Lincoln, who has edited that Epistle for Dr. Lock's Westminster Commentaries (Methuen; 6s.).

Dr. Wickham's purpose is that which was already before the mind of Dale and of Davidson—the purpose of making the general argument of the Epistle clear, and exhibiting it as a whole. How difficult it is to do that by means of the ordinary footnotes no one knows better now, we should say, than Dean Wickham himself. He has not given up the ordinary footnotes. But he has striven hard to prevent the explanation of occasional phrases from becoming those proverbial trees which hide the wood. At the beginning of every section he has given a summary of the argument, and he has attached it to the section that goes before. Then at the end of the section he has a frequent and much fuller note in which he takes the opportunity of tracing the progress of thought, and even, occasionally, of expounding the theology.

But we like Dr. Wickham best of all, and he is at his best, when he is hunting after the significance of some word which has now lost its edge for us. Such a word is *kosmikos* in 9¹, translated in A.V. 'worldly,' and in R.V. 'of this world.' What does he think about it? He is not quite settled in his own mind, but he would like to translate the word 'beautifully ordered.' Thus: 'Now the First Covenant had a sanctuary, a sanctuary which was beautifully ordered.'

Messrs Morgan & Scott have a 'Golden Treasury' series, it seems, as well as Messrs. Macmillan. It consists of reprints (at the price of 1s. net each) of certain books which have already done well in

a more expensive form, and still continue selling. Ten volumes are published, three of which have been noticed already. The seven which remain are Bogatzky's *Golden Treasury*; Saphir's *Christ and the Scriptures*; Meyer's *David, Joseph, and Paul*; Culross's *John*; and Scott's *The Catacombs at Rome*. The last volume is illustrated.

'Father Tyrrell, less than a year before his too early death, speaking of Modernism in America, said: "I cannot understand America. With its freedom and intelligence, its representatives ought to be in the forefront of the Modernist movement. Yet Modernism has produced there hardly an echo. The Church in America is asleep; and I can conceive nothing that will awaken it but the production of some book native to the soil, which will raise so loud a cry of reform that all who have ears must hear."'

That book has now been written. It has been written in the form of *Letters to His Holiness Pope Pius X.* (Open Court; 5s. 6d.) The author's name is not given. For he writes with a severity that is amazing, and it would not be prudent for him to sign his name to his letters. He writes of celibacy, for instance, in a way to make a Protestant wonder.

'The sole possible reason,' he says, 'for retaining celibacy is the belief that unholiness, uncleanness, and a kind of degradation are inseparable from marriage. The literature of Roman Catholic asceticism, the words of Hildebrand and Peter Damianus who did so much to enforce the present discipline, and even the brief quotations given in the first part of this letter from Gregory XVI. and Pius IX., prove this abundantly. Because the priesthood is clean, it can have nothing to do with marriage, which is dirty. There is the real Roman argument, notwithstanding that Rome considers marriage a sacrament. This constant and disgusting preoccupation with the merely physical, this inability to regard the higher offices of wedded life, we are certain to discover in every Roman reasoning upon this subject. Such an attitude is Manichæism, a survival of heathen taboo, a relic of one of the worst superstitions that ever misled mankind. Besides, it is hardly less than a blasphemy against the Author of nature, not a single knowable expression of whose will is favourable to the idea that marriage is debasing, and celibacy intrinsically the higher state of life.'

But that is not a singular quotation. If his Holiness reads the letters he will not read them without emotion.

For the *practice* of the Lord's Prayer, we do not know a better encouragement than a volume entitled *Our Father*, written by the Rev. J. R. Cohu, and published by Messrs. Parker of Oxford (2s. 6d. net).

Character is the most difficult thing that any man is set to make. It needs all the advice and encouragement that experts can provide. The Rev. Henry W. Clark is an expert. His book of *Studies in the Making of Character* (Robert Scott) costs little and is worth much.

The name of M'Cheyne is one of perpetual spiritual fragrance in Scotland. If of any Scottish saint, it may be said of M'Cheyne that 'he being dead yet speaketh.' The books which have been written of him are many. Here is another, *Robert Murray M'Cheyne*, by Mr. J. C. Smith (Elliot Stock; 3s. 6d. net). It is written out of a full heart and under the spell of sacred memories. It is illustrated with pictures of M'Cheyne's work and person.

Under the title of *The Church of England as Catholic and Reformed* (Elliot Stock; 3s. 6d. net), the Rev. W. L. Paige Cox, M.A., discusses questions of reunion. He describes his book as 'An Exposition and an Eirenicon,' and he describes it truly. There have been writers of 'eirenicons' who used the word so that it was difficult for any one to use it afterwards. Let no Nonconformist fear a trap in Canon Paige Cox's use of it.

Yet Canon Paige Cox believes wholly in the Church of England. The way to reunion, he says, is for the Presbyterians to play their proper part. That is to say, let them first bring Congregationalists over to an acceptance of those Catholic principles to which they themselves have adhered, and then let them all go together to the Church of England, 'as a body claiming to be purely Scriptural and Catholic in all its distinctive features.'

The Theosophical Publishing Company of New York has issued a new translation of the Fourth Gospel. Messrs. Luzac & Co. have imported the book into this country. The translator is Mr.

James M. Pryse, who tells us, quite frankly that his purpose is to bring out the hidden meaning behind the language. Are we not told that 'all these things Iêsous spoke to the people in parables, and without a parable he did not speak anything to them'? The teaching, therefore, had an inner and concealed meaning, divulged only to the few who were worthy to receive it. The translation is in modern English, but a great many words are used which modern English has not yet received. The title of the book is *The Magical Message according to Iôannês*. Here are some examples of the translation:

Jn 1¹. 'In a First-principle was the [uttered] Thought, and the Thought was in relation to The God, and the Thought was a God.'

1¹⁴. 'And the Thought became flesh, and encamped among us; and we beheld his Radiance, a Radiance as of a [son] born of one [parent] only (from a father), full of Grace and Truth.'

8⁴⁴. 'You are from the Accuser's Father, and the longings of your Father you will to go on doing. He was a man-slayer from a First-principle, and did not keep his place in the Truth, because there is no Truth in him. When he speaks the False, he speaks from his own; because he is a falsifier, and [so is] his Father.'

The volume has an introduction of essays on the Seen and the Unseen, the Drama of the Soul, etc., together with a series of footnotes explaining those Greek words which have an esoteric meaning. Thus at the verse 18³, 'Ioudas, therefore, having received the company of soldiers, and retainers from the archpriests and Pharisaïans, comes there with lights and torches and weapons,' there is a footnote to 'company of soldiers': 'Gr. *speira*, a body of men-at-arms. But the primary meaning of the word is "a spiral," "a coil," and here it is a word-play referring to the spiral Fire of the Paraklêtos—called in Sanskrit the *kundalini*, or "coiled-up" force.'

What is it that hinders some people—so many people—from believing in the life beyond death? Dr. Newman Smyth says it is their imagination. It is not excess of imagination, nor defect of it. It is because their imagination has not been cultivated in this direction or exercised to this end. There are those who can vividly realize the England on whose shores William the Conqueror landed, or the Rome upon which Marcus Aurelius looked out with his sad eyes, who yet are quite unable to make

out anything reliable 'beyond the veil.' Their imagination has been cultivated on its historical, but not on its spiritual side.

This, then, is the encouragement to be found in a little book entitled *Modern Belief in Immortality*, originally a Lecture given on the Drew Foundation at Hackney College, and now published by Mr. Fisher Unwin (3s. 6d. net).

The *Free Church Year Book* is issued by the National Council of Evangelical Free Churches, and may be had at the Memorial Hall, London, E.C. (2s. 6d. net). It is divided into three sections: first, an account of the Fifteenth National Council; next, the Federation Report; and third, Free Church Information. It is a volume of varied interest, as the phrase goes. There are, in the first place, several sermons; and they are of sufficient value to make a volume of sermons successful even if it cost more money than this volume costs. Then there is theology—theology which is unhesitatingly evangelical and is expressed with unhesitating emphasis by Dr. P. T. Forsyth. There is devotion also—three penetrating short papers by the Rev. W. Redfern, Mr. W. R. Lane, and Principal J. T. Marshall. And, of course, there is the information about the Free Churches which no other volume contains.

Anthropos, one of the greatest of all anthropological periodicals, has reached its fifth volume. Each bi-monthly number is a handsome quarto of about 300 pages. Its contents appear partly in German, partly in French, and partly in English. In the first number of the current volume the articles in English are 'Likenesses to the Story of Moses in Central Africa Folklore,' by Fr. J. Torrend, S.J.; 'The Twelve Lunar Months among the Basuto,' by Justinus Secheho; 'The Great Déné Race,' by Fr. A. G. Morice, O.M.I.; and 'Noun Composition in American Languages,' by Dr. A. L. Kroeber.

The likenesses to the story of Moses are striking enough to make the author, a good anthropologist, believe that the story is one of world-wide prevalence. He dismisses the idea of Christian teaching. And the resemblances, if occasionally surprising, are after all scarcely close enough for that.

Anthropos costs 15s. a year. The office of publication is St. Gabriel-Mödling bei Wien, Austria. Any bookseller will supply the magazine.

Dr. Paul Feine on the Apocalyptic Teaching of Jesus.

BY PROFESSOR THE REV. J. G. TASKER, D.D., HANDSWORTH COLLEGE, BIRMINGHAM.

THE publication of Tyrrell's *Christianity at the Cross Roads*, and of the English translation of Schweitzer's *Von Reimarus zu Wrede*, has forced into prominence a question of which all careful N.T. students have felt both the difficulty and the importance, namely, 'The Apocalyptic Element in our Lord's Teaching: Its Significance for Christian Faith and Ethics.' In the last sentence use has been made of the programme for the Church Congress which meets next October in Cambridge; for in this form the subject is down for discussion. Reviews of Schweitzer's *The Quest of the Historical Jesus* have rightly directed attention to his avowed 'onesidedness' in forcing the Gospels into accord with his view that in the teaching of Jesus the eschatological element is primary; the negative character of his results has also been commented upon by critics of all schools of thought. The problem is ably dealt with in the most recently published Handbook of New Testament Theology.¹ Its author is Dr. Paul Feine, favourably known by his earlier work, *Jesus Christus und Paulus*, as a scholar at once modern in his methods and positive in his conclusions.

The first part of Feine's work is entitled 'The Teaching of Jesus according to the Synoptists,' and the references in this article will be to chapter v., 'The Kingdom of God,' and chapter viii., 'The Ethics of Jesus.' All that can be attempted is to indicate the author's position in regard to subjects now in the forefront of the discussion. As regards the different forms of expression used, 'The Kingdom' is treated as a *terminus technicus* used without further definition because the context makes its meaning plain (Mt 25³⁴, Lk 22^{29f.}). Jesus also speaks of *His Kingdom*, thus showing that He was conscious of His calling as Messiah (Lk 22⁸⁰ 23⁴²). The Jewish people saw the coming of 'the kingdom of our father, David,' when they saw Jesus make His triumphal entry into Jerusalem. In later Judaism 'heaven' was a possible substitute for 'God' in certain phrases;

its employment arose from hesitation to utter the Divine name. The phrase, 'the kingdom of heaven,' may be due to Matthew's adoption of this usage, but it is also possible that Jesus Himself spoke of the kingdom of heaven, and that in the sources which underlie Mk. and Lk. the expression was avoided as likely to be misunderstood by the Greeks, to whom, without an explanation, it would not be intelligible.

In the section which deals with the origin of the phrase, 'the kingdom of God,' in the Old Testament and in Jewish literature, stress is laid upon the substitution in the Targums of abstract expressions referring to the Divine dominion for the Biblical descriptions of God as the King of Israel. His rule belongs to this æon; His dominion is upon earth, although His kingdom has no spatial limitations. The transcendent God manifests Himself in the world. This is the faith of Jesus, but He departs from the Jewish Messianic hope in that He looks for the ideal kingdom of David, that is to say, a spiritual, and not a political kingdom. The description of the kingdom in the Book of Daniel influenced Jesus; He adopted the title 'the Son of Man,' and the conception of a kingdom in which God's will should be supreme. Hence His teaching that the time had come for the establishment of the eternal kingdom; it was the kingdom of heaven, because it was the rule on earth of Heaven's eternal King.

In the teaching of Jesus Feine discovers no warrant for the contention of extremists who maintain that the kingdom of God is to be understood *either* eschatologically *or* ethically, and that if these two points of view are not mutually exclusive, the eschatological or supernatural is primary and dominates the religious or the spiritual. 'Both groups of expressions are found in the Gospels, and to neither may violence be done in the interests of the other.' Passages are examined in which Jesus speaks of the kingdom, sometimes as future, and sometimes as present. On the one hand, the kingdom is to come with power in the immediate future; 'the whole faith of the early Christians in the speedy ushering in of the kingdom of God would be inexplicable, unless it had

¹ *Theologie des Neuen Testaments*. Von D. Dr. Paul Feine, ordentlichem Professor der evangelischen Theologie an der Universität Breslau. Pp. xii, 714. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung.

some foundation in definite sayings of Jesus.' On the other hand, He claims that His mighty works signify that the kingdom has already come. Justice is not done to this side of the teaching of Jesus by those who 'speak of the breaking down of the kingdom of God—the kingdom is already a reality.' The disciples of Jesus are reminded of their blessedness in that it is their privilege to see the days for which the Old Testament saints longed in vain. The context of Lk 17²¹ is held to determine the meaning of ἐντός ὑμῶν. Jesus is refuting the conception of the Pharisees who looked for an outward appearing to be heralded by apocalyptic signs; He reminds them, therefore, that 'the kingdom is within,' not, however, assuming that it is in *them*. The Syriac rendering of Ephraem—'in your hearts'—gives the true explanation. 'What is meant is the state of heart which characterizes the subjects of the kingdom of God.'

How is this twofold element in the teaching of Jesus concerning the kingdom to be accounted for? Some say that both aspects are presented ideally. In this sense 'the kingdom is, and it is not yet.' But Jesus was no idealist, whose thoughts oscillate between an incomplete reality and an anticipated completion. To say that Jesus accepts the diverse statements found in the Old Testament and in later Apocalyptic literature may be true; but, even so, only an external explanation is suggested. We are left in the dark as to why Jesus came to teach that the ideal had a present realization. The unity, accounting for the twofold presentation of the kingdom, is found only in the Messianic consciousness and mission of Jesus. Where *He* is making the will of God to be done on earth by virtue of His indwelling Divine powers, there is the kingdom of God. As Origen beautifully says: 'He is the kingdom itself' (αὐτο-βασιλεία). Forgiveness of sins and communion with God are blessings of the kingdom experienced in the present. But during His earthly activity Jesus sees only the beginning of the realization of these blessings; His divinely appointed task is to complete the work He has begun, and that completion lies in the future.

It depends, therefore, upon the meaning assigned to 'Eschatology' whether the eschatological element in the teaching of Jesus should be described as primary or as secondary. In the form in which it appears in the Synoptic Gospels

and in the early Church it is secondary, inasmuch as it is associated with contemporary ideas. But in so far as it has reference to ethical and religious perfection, which is to have an outward manifestation, eschatology is a primary and essential element in the gospel of Jesus. Feine notes that in the teaching of Jesus, lines, which do not run parallel, can be traced; also that, in the Pauline and in the Johannine writings respectively, each of those lines is drawn out at length. Hence the discussion as to whether Christianity is a religion of hope for the future or of experience in the present. 'Christianity is not rightly understood unless both are included. To the Christian salvation is a present blessing, and yet he must look to the future for its completion.'

What Feine means by saying that Jesus spoke of the kingdom of God in the language of His contemporaries appears in such passages as those which refer to positions of honour in the kingdom (Mt 20²³), the hundredfold reward (Mk 10^{29f.}), and the not-eating of the Passover until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God (Lk 22¹⁶). Such statements are neither to be spiritualized, nor interpreted transcendently. Nevertheless, agreement is expressed with Wernle's words: 'The later theology which transferred blessedness to the future, *i.e.* to heaven, understood Jesus better than modern archæologists who so fix their thoughts on the present world as to forget heaven.' What Jesus means by such descriptions of the glory of the kingdom of God is a condition of blessedness to be attained now by all who enter the kingdom. The blessings of the forgiveness of sins, of purity and righteousness, of the satisfying of the soul's hunger and thirst for God, are set forth in concrete imagery in which use is made of language which would appeal to the hearers of Jesus. Abstractions are avoided, because they would have been less forcible; but there is an entire absence of the grotesque exaggerations which abound in Jewish theology, and in early Christian literature (*e.g.* Enoch 10¹⁷; cf. Papias, as quoted by Irenæus, v, 33⁵). 'The religious conceptions of undisturbed communion with God and of eternal life dominate the thought-world of Jesus.'

In brief, Feine's position is that Jesus only partially adopted the traditional conception of the kingdom of God; to a large extent He filled it with new content. Like His contemporaries, Jesus thought of the kingdom as descending from heaven

to earth. It was the kingdom of *heaven*, because it was the kingdom of the transcendent God who, on earth, was setting up the rule of heaven. Like His contemporaries, Jesus also taught that the kingdom was to be ushered in by God's power in the future. To this extent His conception was eschatological, but there was an essential difference between His idea and those of His Jewish contemporaries. Jesus eliminated all political hopes of a world-kingdom with Jerusalem as its metropolis. The eudæmonistic expectations of an age of extraordinary fruitfulness and of earthly enjoyment had for Him no value. Now and then He makes use of current forms of expression; but His own view is purely religious and ethical. Moreover, this eschatological element in the teaching of Jesus is accompanied by, and interwoven with, an ethical element. The kingdom of God is not only to be anticipated as coming in the future; it is also already established. When men are drawn to Jesus and learn from Him to do on earth the heavenly Father's will, the kingdom is extended. In the person of Jesus the eschatological and the ethical ideas of the kingdom are seen to be not antagonistic, but complementary. To Him belongs the throne of the future Kingdom, but in Him and in His work the powers of the Kingdom are already manifesting their might; hence His parables regard the Kingdom as already spreading in this world.

To the practical consequences of the theory which eschatologically conditions 'the Ethics of Jesus,' Feine returns in a later chapter. In the former part of this section he supplies a necessary corrective to Schweitzer's work which pays little attention to the modifications which Johannes Weiss introduced into the second edition of his book, *The Preaching of Jesus concerning the Kingdom of God*. To the statements in his first edition (1892) exception was taken on the ground that his interpretation led to 'an altogether too negative and world-despising ethics.' In his second edition (1900) he acknowledged that 'part of the ethical teaching of Jesus is unaffected by His eschatological ideas.' Nevertheless, it remains true that to Weiss

an important part of the ethical teaching recorded in the Gospels is incomprehensible, unless it is regarded as exceptional and as suggested by thoughts of the coming crisis. Just as in time of war special laws are proclaimed applicable only for a period, so the moral injunctions of Jesus are to be understood as referring only to a state of affairs which was about to pass away; he taught 'ethics for the interim.'

Examining in detail the expositions of Johannes Weiss, Feine shows that the eschatological interpretation unduly narrows the significance of the moral teaching of Jesus. For example, the command to love one's enemies is, in the Sermon on the Mount, connected not with thoughts of an approaching crisis, but with the revelation of the Heavenly Father, whose ethical perfection is displayed in the impartial bestowal of His gifts on the evil and on the good. Not 'ethics for the interim,' but ethics for all time are inculcated by Jesus when He gives an inward application to the commandments of the law, and condemns angry passions and base desires. Feine is of opinion that the eschatological interpretation may most legitimately be applied to the demand of Jesus that His disciples should, for His sake, give up earthly possessions and family life. But even of these passages he rightly says: 'Not only does eschatology earnestly warn us not to set too high an estimate on the things of this world, but the transitory nature of all earthly good also enforces the same lesson.' These hard sayings have an abiding meaning, as Luther perceived when he wrote, 'And though they take our life, goods, honour, children, wife,' etc. The main part of the following sections of this chapter is occupied with an exposition of the ethics of Jesus from a non-eschatological point of view. Feine holds that 'this earth is God's handiwork; that every individual, every class, every nation has its place as an instrument in God's hand for the carrying out of His world-plan; and that this plan, although we may not understand it as yet, is furthering the blessedness which is the goal of the Kingdom of God.'

In the Study.

Studies in Failure.

III.

The Failure of Success and the Success of Failure.

Mk 10³¹—‘Many that are first shall be last, and the last first.’ The other places in the Gospels in which this saying occurs are Mt 19³⁰ 20¹⁶, Lk 13³⁰. The best title for it is that given by Mozley in his *University Sermons*: ‘The Reversal of Human Judgment.’ And Mozley’s sermon is one of the greatest that ever was preached on this great theme.

Mozley interprets the words as meaning simply that the judgments which we form in this world will be reversed in another; and he uses the text as an argument for the suspense of judgment. But the words carry a larger meaning than that. Even in this life we see men first at the beginning, last at the end. We see men first in the estimation of the multitude, last in the estimation of the discerning.

i.

Failure at the outset may be success in the end. Says Mr. Harry Quilter, ‘An accomplished artist said to me once, “No picture is worth anything till it has been spoiled three times”; and it is true, I think, that what makes any given picture great is gathered from the very brink of failure.’¹ ‘Throngs of witnesses,’ says Bishop Lightfoot, ‘might be produced to illustrate this same truth—great statesmen, great orators, great generals, great philanthropists, great mechanics, have failed at first to succeed afterwards. The great Florentine reformer Savonarola commenced his mission. His first attempt was a total failure. He kindled no enthusiasm. His audiences dwindled away. He could not obtain a hearing. So a year passed away, and another, and another. It was failure still. But an unquenchable fire was burning within him, and he knew that it was not an earthly flame. Then at length “on a sudden,” we are told, “he burst out; appalling, entrancing, shaking the souls of men, piercing to their heart of hearts, and drawing them in awestruck crowds before the foot of his pulpit.” No preacher since the Apostolic days produced such striking effects as he produced.’

¹ W. L. Watkinson, *Studies in Christian Character*, i. 18.

The great English engineer George Stephenson furnishes a signal illustration of this lesson. He commenced life with the most serious disadvantages of education. He found all scientific men against him. He was confronted with the giant mass of popular *inertia* and distrust. But he was conscious of a great idea; he clung to it; and he persevered dauntlessly. ‘I have fought for the locomotive single-handed,’ he said, ‘for nearly twenty years, having no engineer to help me. I put up with every rebuff, determined not to be put down.’ At length the locomotive did triumph. And look at the consequences. Railways have revolutionized the conditions of society, not in England only, but throughout the world.²

But all such examples pale into nothing before the lesson of the life of Christ. History itself has reversed the judgment passed on Christ. It will reverse many of the judgments we are now forming on our fellow-men.

Speak, History! who *are* life’s victors?

Unroll the long annals, and say—

Are they those whom the world *called* the victors—

Who won the success of a day?

The Martyrs or Nero? The Spartans

Who fell at Thermopylæ’s tryst,

Or the Persians and Xerxes? His

Judges or Socrates? Pilate or Christ?

An old Greek philosopher—the wisest of his race—nearly four centuries before Christ, drew from his imagination a picture of the ideal righteous man. It was an essential feature in the portrait that he should be tested by the extreme of adversity, that he should be misrepresented and misunderstood; that, though righteous, he should be considered unrighteous; that he should meet with obloquy and persecution and shame; last of all—a strange, instinctive prophecy—he was to die on the gibbet. This old philosopher rightly divined. It was essential that the ideal man should fail, utterly fail, in life. Christ’s perfection could only be manifested by entire failure. This failure is the most brilliant jewel in His heavenly crown; the richest portion of the inheritance which He has bequeathed to us.³

I. Such early failure may be a test of strength. Some men can carry on their work when paid with popular applause. They may even defy the larger circle without, if they have the approval of friends or party. But when friends look grave, when a gulf opens between principles and party, when the world misrepresents his motives and thwarts his endeavours, it is then that the strain on a man’s

² J. B. Lightfoot, *Sermons in St. Paul’s Cathedral*, p. 132.

³ J. B. Lightfoot, *ibid.* p. 130.

courage begins. But it is just then that a man should find his support in the pattern, the spirit, the life of Christ.

The Young Pretender, leader in the Scottish rebellion of 1745, kicked against defeat instead of quietly asking how he might turn it into victory. Says Mr. Froude, 'He was a man who carried failure written in his very demeanour.' 'When he doth hear anything contrarious to his pleasures,' Lord Surrey said, 'his manner is to take his bonnet off his head and throw it in the fire. My Lord Dacre doth affirm that at his being last in Scotland he did burn above a dozen bonnets in that manner.' This was not a temper to cope successfully with the ablest of living generals. 'If he be such a man,' Surrey wisely judged, 'with God's grace, we shall speed the better with him.'¹

2. Early failure may be also a test of faith. A man believes in himself as long as others believe in him. But when he finds himself on one side and the world on the other, he asks himself whether he alone can be right. He begins by questioning whether the voice he hears is indeed God's voice; and he ends by stifling the witness of the Spirit within him.

But the danger is not so much that we shall turn atheists or unbelievers, as that we shall be disheartened; not that we shall lose all faith, but that we shall find our faith weakened; not that we shall stake our life on winning something, at least, here in this world, but that we shall stake the keenness, the earnestness, the perseverance of our service. A man is kind to his poorer neighbours, and then waxes weary of being kind, because he does not find them so grateful as he expected. A man is diligent in his duty, and then relaxes his diligence, because another, with only half the exertion, runs past him. A tradesman is scrupulously honest, and then finds that others, who are not so strict, seem, as it were, to take the bread out of his mouth, while he gets no credit for his scrupulous honesty, and so he lets himself slip into little unfairnesses. A man in society is thoroughly unselfish, and finds that the only result is that he is unceremoniously thrust aside; or he is humble, and finds a vain man preferred to himself. In all such cases there is, of course, some danger that we should simply give up trying to do right; that we should say to ourselves, 'I have tried it, and it does not answer, and I mean to try it no more.' But that is not the only danger, nor the commonest danger, nor, I think, the greatest danger. The great danger is that we should

relax the warmth and heartiness of our service, as if somehow we were pained at not being better appreciated.²

3. Emerson in his essay on 'Success'³ names three things as essential to success—

1. *Aptitude.* He gives many examples. Napoleon is one example. 'There is nothing in war,' said Napoleon, 'which I cannot do by my own hands. If there is nobody to make gunpowder, I can manufacture it. The gun-carriages I know how to construct. If it is necessary to make cannons at the forge, I can make them. The details of working them in battle, if it is necessary to teach, I shall teach them. In administration, it is I alone who have arranged the finances, as you know.'

Oliver Goldsmith, one of the sweetest of English writers, was trained for medicine. He presented himself at Surgeons' Hall to be examined. His purpose was to secure the unambitious post of hospital mate. But he was rejected, and the record in the college book runs, 'James Bernard, mate to an hospital; Oliver Goldsmith, found not qualified for ditto.' In about eight years *The Vicar of Wakefield* saw the light. The original failure had been complete, and momentarily disheartening; but genius had transmuted it into a golden service to English letters.⁴

2. *Self-trust.* 'There was a wise man,' says Emerson, 'an Italian artist, Michel Angelo, who writes thus of himself: "Meanwhile the Cardinal Ippolito, in whom all my best hopes were placed, being dead, I began to understand that the promises of this world are for the most part vain phantoms, and that to confide in one's self, and become something of worth and value, is the best and safest course." Now, though I am by no means sure that the reader will assent to all my propositions, yet I think we shall agree in my first rule for success,—that we shall drop the brag and the advertisement, and take Michel Angelo's course, "to confide in one's self, and be something of worth and value."'⁵

3. *The Affirmative.* 'We must begin,' Emerson says, 'by affirming. Truth and goodness subsist for evermore. It is true there is evil and good, night and day; but these are not equal. The day is great and final. The night is for the day, but the day is not for the night. . . . The affirmative of affirmatives is love. The painter Giotto, Vasari

² F. Temple, *Rugby Sermons*, 2nd ser., p. 269.

³ *Society and Solitude*, p. 267.

⁴ W. J. Lacey, *Masters of To-Morrow*, p. 164.

⁵ Emerson, *Society and Solitude*, p. 274.

¹ W. J. Lacey, *Masters of To-Morrow*, p. 169.

tells us, renewed art because he put more goodness into his heads.'

4. But in estimating success and failure we must take into account the lack of opportunity. Though it is true that there are men, like Josiah Wedgwood, Lincoln, and Garfield, who make opportunity for themselves, yet for the most part men have to be judged not by what they are, but by what they are in relation to their opportunities. Canon H. D. Rawnsley has a volume of sermons on the 'Sayings of Jesus' discovered by Grenfell and Hunt at Oxyrhynchus. In one of these Sayings occur the words of our text; and the lesson which Canon Rawnsley finds in this particular 'Saying' is 'judged not.' He says:

'We clergy have our ideas of right and wrong; we are scandalized, for example, by the coarseness of speech, the want of external honour for religious observance say of the crew of an "ocean-tramp" steamer. When other folk are at church and chapel, they are found "running" corn or loading coal, and their language is not the language of polite society. We judge them, but we forget that their Sunday labour, and their exposure to tempests of the ocean and to the thieves and harlots of the home or foreign port, are the price at which we decent churchgoers get our corn and wine, our comforts of food and clothes and our home luxuries—we forget, as an able writer lately put it, that if vicarious sacrifice is the highest height, the deepest heart of morals, then these men who have sacrificed the interests of their bodies and souls for the rest of us are in their unchurched paganism actually a great deal higher than we. And when we have touched hands with these men and known their childlike simplicity, their quick response to what is higher when it is offered, their splendid courage and their devotion to duty, we shall more than ever incline to revise our estimate of them, from the church or chapel standard, and we shall seek for some new definition as to who is high and who is low in the kingdom of Heaven.'

ii.

Temporal failure may be eternal success. Dean Church, in his *Cathedral and University Sermons* (p. 236), has a sermon on 'Failures in Life.' His text is a quotation from St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians, written from a Roman prison—"For

¹ H. D. Rawnsley, 'Sayings of Jesus' and a *Lost Gospel Fragment*, p. 121.

I have no man like minded who will naturally care for your state. For all seek their own, not the things which are Jesus Christ's' (Ph 2^{20, 21}). St. Paul's life at this time, he says, must have seemed like what we call a failure. And later, when the old man was led out along the Ostian Way to die, it must have appeared to friend and foe alike that his career had ended in disaster. Not so to St. Paul himself. 'What to him was the wise world's sentence on his course, or the contrast between its earlier successes and its later baffling disappointments? What was it to him, who knew in whom he had believed—to whom it was a small matter to be judged by man's judgment, yea, who judged not his own self—who knew that everything that happened to him was but a passing incident in an eternal progress, which stretched far beyond the grave, and of which the end was certain?' Then Church says: 'Failure, when it meets us, is bitter and hard to bear, to us who are so ambitious and so weak, so sanguine and so shortsighted. But what is it, but the inevitable incident of that mingled greatness and littleness of human life, of which, if we will only attend, every passing hour reminds us? "Heaven is for those who have failed on earth," says the mocking proverb; and since the day of Calvary no Christian need be ashamed to accept it.'

The word *Finis* is not yet written in the book of human history. Our horizon cannot be bounded by the senses, nor our deepest instincts viewed as mere provincialisms of this planet destined to vanish when riper knowledge dawns upon us. Though we carry nothing else out of the world, we carry out ourselves. There is continuity in the thread of existence, and no suddenness about sequels. Life is intended to be a long *crescendo*, marked not only by gain in calmer and wiser thought, in the ability to solve more complex problems and to discharge more arduous tasks, but also by those growing desires that stimulate to spiritual ascension. It will take time to perfect man. Will it not take eternity?

And what is our failure here but a triumph's evidence
For the fulness of the days?²

I. Who are the last that shall be first? Spurgeon divides them into four classes:

1. Some that are last in pedigree. 'God will find His jewels in the dens and alleys and slums of London, and take up to His eternal throne those that were the sons of harlots and the children of the thief, that they may sing for ever of His amazing grace.'

² W. T. Herridge, *The Coign of Vantage*, p. 34.

2. Some that are last in education. 'If you should go into our ragged schools, especially some in the very lowest neighbourhoods, or if you would hear Mr. Gregory, the missionary in St. Giles's, tell his tale of all the sin he sees, and the education that our young men of St. Giles's get, O gentlemen of St. James's, it might well make you blush. But some who were trained for the gallows and tutored for the convict settlement shall nevertheless be taught of the Lord and inducted into the fellowship of the saints.'

3. Some that are last in morals. 'Could Sodom find sinners that would match with the sinners of London? You need not, to-night, go many steps when once the sun is down before you will see under every gaslight some that are last. Blessed be God, some of them shall be first. "There goes John Bradford, if it were not for the grace of God."'

While pæns to the conquerors are plentiful enough, it is not so often that we hear an *Io Victis!*

IO VICTIS.

The hymn of the low and the humble, the weary, the broken in heart,
Who strove and who failed, acting bravely a silent and desperate part;
Whose youth bore no flower in its branches, whose hopes burned in ashes away,
From whose hand slipped the prize they had grasped at, who stood at the dying of day
With the work of their life all around them, unpitied, unheeded, alone,
With death swooping down on their failure, and all but their faith overthrown.¹

2. Low success may be high failure. In the world's 'success,' the acquisition of wealth is often accepted as the greatest test of what a man is worth. '*Rem, rem, quocunque modo rem!*' is the world's motto. And yet how often a man's success in this direction means deviation from uprightness and the destruction of the whole spirit of charity; we see—alas! how often—that the acquisition of wealth lowers and degrades a soul; that wealth is gained by those cruelties which we as a society are striving to exterminate. We recognize the confirmation of the truth, so awful for some, that '*where our treasure is there will our heart be also.*' To grovel in auriferous mire—is that success or failure? Again, success is a power, and yet how rarely can the ambitious man be unselfish? Generally, his ambition is not to promote the

good of others but rather to attain his own ends at their expense; seldom can such as he be honest! As a rule, does he not rather sacrifice principle, character, convictions, truthfulness, even what the world deems honour; and shall such ambition, hereafter, when brought before the Judge of quick and dead, be proclaimed success or *failure*? Once more, is pleasure success? I mean that pleasure which intoxicates the soul, which prevents all serious recollection, which makes light of sin, which arrests obedience to Christ, which gratifies our love of ease, and our self-indulgence? I mean even the pleasure which leaves us, perhaps, not far from the kingdom of God, but nevertheless leaves us only there: is that success?²

3. And low failure may be high success. Twenty years ago a discouraged young doctor in one of our large cities was visited by his old father, who came up from a rural district to look after his boy.

'Well, son,' he said, 'how are you getting along?'

'I am not getting along at all,' was the disheartened answer. 'I'm not doing a thing.'

The old man's countenance fell, but he spoke of courage and patience and perseverance. Later in the day he went with his son to the 'Free Dispensary,' where the young doctor had an unsalaried position, and where he spent an hour or more every day.

The father sat by, a silent but intensely interested spectator, while twenty-five poor unfortunates received help. The doctor forgot his visitor while he bent his skilled energies to this task; but hardly had the door closed on the last patient when the old man burst out—

'I thought you told me you were not doing anything,' he thundered. 'Not doing anything! Why, if I had helped twenty-five people in a month as much as you have done in one morning, I would thank God that my life counted for something.'

'There isn't any money in it, though,' explained the son, somewhat abashed at his father's vehemence.

'Money!' the old man shouted, still scornfully. 'Money! What is money in comparison with being of use to your fellow-men? Never mind about money; you go right along at this work

² H. Montagu Villiers in *Sermons on Social Subjects*, p. 138.

¹ See W. T. Herridge, *The Coin of Vantage*, p. 33.

every day. I'll go back to the farm and gladly earn money enough to support you as long as I live—yes, and sleep sound every night with the thought that I have helped you to help your fellow-men.'¹

4. Are there any tests of final success? There are at least these two:

1. *Dissatisfaction* with present attainment. 'It is strange to say, but it is a truth which our own observation and experience will confirm, that when a man discerns in himself most sin and humbles himself most, when his comeliness seems to him to vanish away and all his graces to wither, when he feels disgust at himself and revolts at the thought of himself,—seems to himself all dust and ashes, all foulness and odiousness, then it is that he is really rising in the kingdom of God: as it is said of Daniel, "From the first day that thou didst set thine heart to understand and to chasten thyself before thy God, thy words were heard, and I am come for thy words" (Dn 10¹²).'²

In one of Landor's *Imaginary Conversations*, Newton says to Barrow, 'I am not quite satisfied.' To which Barrow answers, 'Those who are quite satisfied sit still and do nothing; those who are not quite satisfied are the sole benefactors of the world.'³

Lord Kelvin's estimate of his work irresistibly reminds us of Sir Isaac Newton's. 'One word,' he tells us, 'characterizes the most strenuous of the efforts for the advancement of science I have made perseveringly during fifty-five years; that word is "failure." I know no more of electric and magnetic force, or of the relation between ether, electricity, and ponderable matter, than I knew and tried to teach to my students of natural philosophy fifty years ago in my first session as professor.'⁴

¹ *Sermons by Unitarian Ministers*, p. 68.

² J. H. Newman, *Parochial and Plain Sermons*, vi. p. 324.

³ W. T. Herridge, *The Coign of Vantage*, p. 25.

⁴ S. P. Thompson, *Life of Lord Kelvin*, 1910.

2. *Aspiration*. 'There is a heavenly contest,' says Jowett, 'of which God only and the angels are spectators. It begins here but does not end here; and it includes in itself all other careers of men. The prize which it offers is not exactly greatness or honour, but something of another kind which we can only conceive in part. The ideal which it holds out to us is moral rather than intellectual, the freedom from pride and prejudice and self, the absolute simplicity of truth, the resignation to the order of the world and to the divine will; and not resignation only, but active co-operation with them, according to our means and strength, in bringing good out of evil, truth out of falsehood. He whose mind is absorbed in these thoughts has already found life eternal. He may be a cripple, or blind, or deaf; "his home may be a straw-built shed"; but he has learnt to see and hear with another sense, and is already living in a house not made with hands or of man's building. And this perfect harmony with the divine will is the best image or likeness which we can form of that other kingdom of God in which we hope one day to be part-takers.'⁵

Then, welcome each rebuff
That turns earth's smoothness rough,
Each sting that bids nor sit nor stand, but go!
Be our joys three-parts pain!
Strive, and hold cheap the strain;
Learn, nor account the pang; dare, never
grudge the throe!

For thence—a paradox
Which comforts while it mocks—
Shall life succeed in that it seems to fail:
What I aspired to be,
And was not, comforts me:
A brute I might have been, but would not sink
i' the scale.⁶

⁵ B. Jowett, *College Sermons*, p. 261.

⁶ Browning, 'Rabbi Ben Ezra.

The Traditions of the Masai.

BY FRITZ HOMMEL, PH.D., PROFESSOR OF SEMITIC LANGUAGES IN THE UNIVERSITY OF MUNICH.

II.

To come now to the *traditions*: we must, first of all, lay emphasis on the fact that, however far back we go into the primitive times of any Semitic race by means of linguistic comparisons, investigation of names, and literary remains, we can always discover an accumulation of myths, which are very similar to the Bible stories (fight of the dragons at the creation of the world, the tree of Paradise and the serpent, original ancestors, flood), and, further, as their religion a moon-cult (star-cult) which might almost be described as henotheism. But we come across the same thing in a more primitive way among our cattle-nomads, the Masai, and here we must draw attention to the fact that among the oldest Semites, whom we must regard as cultivators rather than nomads, the ox, as their mythology clearly shows, must have played an important part—not small cattle, or the camel and the ass, not to mention the horse, which first became known to the Semites of Elam about 2000 B.C.

Moreover, among the Masai we come upon a series of distinctly ancient characteristics, which bring us near to the East Arabian home of the whole of the Western Semites, and which we do not encounter anywhere else very clearly except in the religion of the ancient Chaldeans (transformed later in the more polytheistically stamped religion of the Babylonians). To these belong, in the first place, the struggle of God with the dragon *Nenaunir* on the morning of the creation. Merker compares the Bab. *tiāmat* (later common pronunciation probably *tiamas*) with the word for 'dragon,' *en-diamassi* (fem.); and this is certainly not merely an accidental resemblance, since the word for 'Paradise,' *kerio*, goes back to the Bab. *kirū*, 'garden,' which in the time of Hammurabi must have been sounded uncontracted *kiriū* (cf. similarly Nabû-Nebo, at that time *Nabiu*, and many other examples).¹ Now, in ancient Chaldean astro-

logy this original dragon is the female lion-headed dragon with the long neck (located in the later sign of Cancer) which appears on the seal-cylinders as a lion's or dragon's head set on a stake (her consort is the so-called vulture-dragon, the Kingu of the Bab. Creation Epic); but, according to Hollis (p. 265), *nenaunir* is called 'she of the stake,' and she was originally a lion (or half-lion, half-man, with which should be compared the Chaldean antitype of the Twins, the Janus-headed centaur, or Sagittarius, which has a lion's and a human head). To this series of characteristics belongs also the name of the morning-star, *kilegen*, which is just the Bab. *girgilu*, 'hen'; cf. the name of Venus, *Nin-dar-anna*, 'mistress of the hen of the sky' (also masculine, corresponding to the nature of the morning-star, in contrast with that of the evening-star), *Nin-dar-a*, in Gudea, which appears in ancient Sumerian hymns as *Gašan-Gir-gi-lu* (*Cun. Texts*, xv. 23; cf. Reisner, *Hymnen*, p. 138, line 126 ff.). The sacred number of Ištar (S. Arab. masc. Astar), 15, plays a part at Masai births; among the el-Gargures (cf. the Abyss. Guragues?) race, who at one time were neighbours of the Masai, the mother, after the birth of a boy, had to remain in the hut for thirty days, and, after that of a girl, only fifteen (30 is the moon-number; cf. Bab. Sin 30, his daughter Ištar 15); cf. Merker, p. 293, where the 15 gourd-bottles with which the young man seeks the girl in marriage at her father's house should be noticed. If the three-headed serpent of Paradise was called *ol-arassumet* because it lived in the bushes (*ol-rossua*), it is tempting to think here also of a peculiarly Bab. word, namely, *rušumtu*, 'mud,' 'marsh' (the rush really grows near the latter).

As regards the character of the Masai legends, it is absolutely primitive, and in all its resemblances to Biblical stories it is an entirely independent flow from the same source. This is shown especially by the fact that almost entirely different names appear: thus Maitumbe corresponds to Adam (perhaps from a second form of Adam, *ma'dūmu* or *maidūmu*?); Tumbainot to Noah; Oschomó,

¹ If *en-diamassi* in Masai also means 'fetus' or 'embryo,' here also the Arabic offers a striking analogy; cf. Arab. *el-gānn* (from *el-gānin*), 'demon,' but *el-gānin*, 'embryo.' In ancient times demons were actually thought of as dragons and similar monsters.

Bartímaro, and Barmáo to his three sons, Shem, Ham, and Japheth; Narabá, or its doublet Metene, to Moses (cf. Metene and Rise = Moses and Aaron); Mutari to Isaac; etc. But what has not yet been observed is the precisely similar fondness for popular etymologies which are given for every one of the Masai names in these legends. If we compare the Hebrew explanations of the names Eve (Gn 3²⁰), Cain (4¹), Seth (4²⁵), Noah (5²⁹), Abraham (17⁵), Isaac (21⁶), Jacob (25²⁶), Reuben (29³²), etc., down to Moses (Ex 2⁵⁰) and Samuel (1 S 1²⁰), with the meanings of names in the Masai myths, we find that these also are often very far-fetched. For instance, Naiterogob (= Eve) called her second son *Nabe* because he had moved violently in her womb (*ebe*); Nairascho bore a son, and called him *Serea* because the ox which was killed by his father after the birth was spotted (*sera*). Must we not in astonishment exclaim with Adam, at this all-pervading fondness for interpreting, in some way or other, all the ancient names that were handed down: 'This is bone of my bone, and flesh of my flesh' (*i.e.* parallel organic higher development of a common tendency of ancient races, therefore similar disposition)? This is completely denied' by sceptics, who object that missionaries (it is all the same whether of early times, *e.g.* the first Christian century or later) communicated these stories in the Biblical setting (and along with those Biblical etymologies) to the Masai, who afterwards re-modelled them according to their understanding and mental life, and therefore completely assimilated them to their own national sentiment, so much so, indeed, that they even freely imitated the interpretation of names. But this would be almost a greater wonder than the simple view advocated by Merker, that the Masai brought all these traditions with them from their ancient Arabian home, and that they (these old traditions) run parallel with the Hebrew ones, and that at the base of both there lies a former Chaldaeian or East Arabian original which is lost to us.¹ This state

¹ As regards the above-quoted examples (with reference to chapter and verse only), we shall now give at least one example for those who have not an Old Testament at hand. In Gn 25²⁵ we read: 'And the first [of the twins] came forth red [*admóni*, a play upon the word *Edom*], and [rough] all over like a hairy garment [*se'ar*], and they called his name [therefore] Esau [*'esau*, in which the similarity of sound between *se'* in *se'ar* and *'es* in *'esau* was enough for the formation]; and after that came forth his brother, and his hand had hold on Esau's heel [*'akeb*]; and his name was [therefore]

of affairs is, and will certainly remain, wonderful enough; but the imageless monotheism of the savage Masai, which is disputed by nobody, is also a wonder, and is unprecedented among the races of Africa.

I now come to the traditions themselves, which Merker, in the second paragraph of his sensational fourth section, has already compared bit by bit with the corresponding features of the Biblical tradition. It must now be remarked that Merker, who, as he told me himself, had not paid any attention to the ancient stories in Genesis since his childhood, did not notice all the similarities, but overlooked some of the most important. Sellin, who himself in 1905 wrote a pamphlet on 'Die biblische Urgeschichten' (in the *Biblische Zeit- und Streitfragen*, ed. by Boehmer and Kropatschek, Lichterfelde, pub. by Edw. Runge, 1 Serie, Heft 11), drew attention, in his discussion of Merker's book in *Die Reformation*, 1905, Jahrg. iv. pp. 418-421, to the parallel between the lame Schagarda and Jacob (Gn 32²⁶). But it is a still more important fact that the Masai, exactly like the Hebrews in Gn 4, count, from the creation of the world to the Deluge, *seven ancestors*, the seventh of whom had three sons, whose correspondence with the Biblical ones the following table will make clear:

Maitumbe,	Adam.	Lemajan,	Mahujaél.
Sindillo,	Abel. ²	Learin,	Methuselah.
Serea, ³	Enoch.	Lengeni, ⁵	Lamech.
Schagarda, ⁴	'Irad.		

called *Ja'kob*.² But, as a matter of fact, Jacob goes back to a fuller form, Jacob-el (in which God is the subject, therefore meaning perhaps, 'God follows at the heels,' *i.e.* He rewards or punishes).

² Instead of Cain. As the first murder is placed by the Masai a short time before the Flood (to give it a motive as a judgment), the story of Abel and Cain is omitted here. And it really occurs a second time in Genesis (at the end of chap. 4) by way of an allusion (cf. Jabel=Abel, Jubal=Cain, and Tubal=Naemah, as the original text probably read); but it must be observed that Sindillo has a brother Sisía, from whom the smiths are descended (Cain really means 'smith').

³ He builds the first *kraal*, as (Gn 4) Cain builds the first town for Enoch, which is called Enoch after Enoch's name.

⁴ Also Ol-Ogarde, in which the similarity in sound to 'Irad (LXX Γαιδαδ for Γαιραδ) should be noticed.

⁵ *I.e.* assuming Lamkan instead of Lamech (cf. Gn 5, Kainan, instead of Gn 4, Kain). Without saying a word, I have put Lengeni instead of his brother Tumbainot (= Noah; cf. *dombo*, 'ark,' Heb. *tebah*), which is quite permissible, as Tumbainot had three sons by Naipande—Oschomó, Barti-

There is another agreement which has not been observed before, namely, the four plagues after the Deluge (Merker, p. 286 f.): (1) illness (after the first theft), (2) dung-beetles (after the unintentional killing of a sucking she-ass), (3) locusts (after the murder of a cow) followed by famine, and (4) pest (or the *urgeg*-epidemic); cf. also the augmented list of the ten plagues in Ex 7 ff., in which the four plagues of the Masai just mentioned are all represented, and—a fact to which my former pupil, Dr. Otto Weber, called my attention—for the quaternary number the four plagues in the Bab. description of the Deluge (par. 187 ff.), lions, jackals, hunger, and pest.

As regards the giving of the Ten Commandments from the Mount of God, it is characteristic of the Masai tradition that there is not a figure corresponding to Moses, who announces the sacred laws, but an angel, therefore the *ma'ak Jahweh* of the Old Testament, in the shape of a man (cf. Dn 7¹³ and Adapad, *i.e.* Marduk of Eridu, in the Bab. myth) with two wings and only one leg,¹

maro, and Barmáo (= Shem, Ham, and Japheth); but by Nahaba-Logúnja (cf. with this double name the two wives of Lamech—Ada and Zillah), the widow of his adopted brother, Lengeni, he also had other three sons (who, according to the regulations of levirate marriage, must be rightly regarded as sons)—Lesita, L'olgesan, and L'os-sero (= Jabal, Jubal, and Tubal). Therefore there also circulated among the ancestors of the Masai double reports (or myth-variants) similar to the parallel lists of forefathers among the Hebrews (Gn 4, 5). Evidently, to obtain the sacred number 7, Gn 4 chose Noah, and the Masai narrator chose Lengeni (put by me above instead of Tumbainot)=Lamech; the number 10 in Gn 5 (cf. Berosus on this point) was got by assuming God (read Edom instead of Adam) and the Divine-human mediator (Seth=λόγος=Adapad; cf. THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, xiv. 103-109).

¹ The description of the angel as a one-legged being may be simply the naïve expression for 'lame in the hip' or 'limping,' which at once tempts one to think of the lame fire-god of the Greeks (the Chaldean Nebo, as Nuskugibil, is also a fire-god) and of Ex 37²⁶ (where, according to the right interpretation, it was not Jacob's hip that was put out of joint, but rather the angel's who wrestled with him, in spite of 37³²). And the hip-lame Schagarda=Irak ('*I-grad* means 'the fire descended'; cf. Bab. *Arad-Gibil*) corresponds to Nebo-Nusku (see my pamphlet, *Die altoriental. Denkmäler und das alte Testament*,² Berlin, 1903, p. 30). The Egyptian description of Ptah and Osiris goes back to a similar idea; cf. the illustration in Budge, *Gods of the Egyptians*, vol. ii., between p. 130 and p. 131, in which Osiris, in the quaint mummy-like disguise, really appears to have only one leg, and carries a long sceptre, like a stick, in his hand. It should also be noticed that the eldest son of the god of heaven, *ol-Gurugur*, who appears as the

so that he could not move along except in leaps by means of a stick; he was called *ol-Dirima* (from *diriman*, 'crutch')—a name which is preserved in Arab. *darrâm* ('walking with a limping gait'). Among the neighbouring race of the *el-Marimar* (cf. the Nuban race *Wa'wa'* of the Egyptian inscriptions—which by phonetic laws has arisen from *Warwar*, and is preserved in the modern name *Berber* north of Khartum) God is called *Sita* (cf. the Biblical Seth in Gn 5 and also note⁵ on p. 463, *ad fin.*), who is said to have been worshipped in the form of a human figure with only one leg, and therefore probably corresponds to this *ol-Dirima*.

I do not think that this Masai story of the giving of the Law necessarily presupposes the knowledge of the announcement by Moses of the Ten Commandments, of which the so-called Book of the Covenant is certainly the completion,² but that it was a traditional characteristic of ancient tradition long before the time of Moses that, when commandments were given by God, they were always given in the number 10, the sacred number of the Divine 'messenger' and scribe of God, Nebo;³ besides, most of the Mosaic commandments were there before Moses, and it was the mission of this man of God, who certainly belongs to history, merely to announce them to his fellow-countrymen in a new arrangement and augmented by the Book of the Covenant.

This brings me to the last point, namely, the attempt which Merker makes in the third paragraph of his fourth section to equate the Masai patriarch *ol-Eberet* with the Hebrews, and—what to me seemed fatal from the beginning—the old Masai stock, the Ameroi, with the Biblical (originally perhaps the Iranian-Hittite) Amorites. If we consider how common Arabic names of races and

mediator between God and man (Merker, *Masai*,² p. 206), recalls in a striking way the old Sumerian name of Marduk of Eridu, *Gurru-gulla* (-*dug*), in a later development *Shilig* (from *gurug* -*gulla-dug*; but this may be an accidental resemblance, as thunder is called *ki-kurukur* in Masai, and Gurugur appears in thunder and lightning).

² With the end of the Book of the Covenant (Ex 23¹⁹=34²⁶, 'Thou shalt not seethe the kid in its mother's milk') cf. the similar horror of eating flesh along with milk among the Masai (Merker, pp. 33 and 232).

³ Cf. Sin (the moon) 30, and his daughter Istar (Venus) 15. Šamaš (the sun) 20 and his son Nusku 10 stood in a similar relation, but Nusku is only a doublet of Nebo, which, therefore, is entirely wanting in the Bab. list of Divine numbers (K. 170).

persons like el-Âmir, 'Amâra, 'Imrân (from Amirân) are, there is not the slightest reason for connecting the Ameroi with the Amorites, who played a part in Palestine only, and came from the north. It is far more probable that ol-Eberet, in case the Arabic al-Abrahat (Abyss. Abraha, which, it is true, is usually supposed to be the same as the Heb. Abraham), or another Arabic name with a similar sound, is not to be compared, is identical with 'Eber, the mythical ancestor of the Hebrews, while ol-Eberet's son Geréua bears a striking resemblance to Eber's grandson *Re'û* (LXX Περγου, shortened from Re'û-el, Reguel) (Gn 11¹⁸); but, as the district of 'Eber-Peleg coincides with the Arabian district Jemâma, this points directly back again to East Arabia, the original home of all the Western Semites.¹

While the Masai traditions, as they at last became accessible to Merker after long effort, are always carefully guarded by a few older people, there are also among the myths generally current among the Masai, as they became known to Hollis in British East Africa, some which must be regarded as distinct echoes of the sacred myths. Among them I include what Hollis (p. 270) relates of the god Naiteru-kop (but the word has the fem. art., therefore the female beginner of the world, the first female of the country), in which, therefore, the Eve of the Masai has become a deity, while the opposite would be much more incomprehensible; the sending down of the cattle from heaven (Hollis, p. 270; cf. Merker, p. 272), and the story of Le-eyo's disobedience (Hollis, p. 271), in which I detect a faint echo of Merker's description of the Fall, which coincides so strikingly with the Bible. When we consider how widespread was the association of the tree of Paradise with the snake in the ancient East (down to the time of the Greeks), the preservation of this feature

among the Masai along with the rest is not so very wonderful.²

I close this article with the sure expectation that now, when my deceased friend's book has appeared in a second edition, the traditions of the Masai will no longer meet with the scepticism to which they were exposed when they were first divulged, but that they will be duly appreciated in their incalculable importance for the history of religion, as they deserve to be. And I repeat once more, that a Christian or Jewish influence of a former time (at all events through Christian Nuba from the third century A.D., or through the Jewish Falashas on the borders of Abyssinia), or from the older northern abodes of the Masai, is out of the question, because then—a fact which Merker had emphasized—one would necessarily have expected connexions not only with the history of the Biblical ancestors and patriarchs down to the giving of the Law, but also with the later parts of Biblical history (and especially some sort of allusion to the Gospels, in the event of Christian missionaries coming into consideration). The above-mentioned connexions with the Chaldæan traditions, and these even in points where the Bible does not show such a connexion,³ entirely do away with all doubt.

² I might, in passing, also draw attention to the fact that the name of the old medicine-man *Lesigiriätschi* (Merker, p. 289) is certainly to be compared with *i-Sigiriätschi*—the name given to the Somali by the Masai.

³ To these probably belongs the remarkable resemblance between the name of the primitive dragon (*diamassi=tiämat*) Nenaunir, and *Ki-Nunir*, 'place of combat,' an originally mythical locality in the ancient Bab. district of the Eastern Tigris (Kvirinta of the Zendavesta, where the three-headed dragon Dahâka-Zohak was defeated; cf. also the three-headed snake of Paradise of the Masai) near Sirgulla; cf. also the pole form of the tree *e'naunir* (Merker, p. 280, and the above-mentioned (p. 462) Masai etymology of Nenaunir, with which may then be compared the Bab. *gi-ku-nir* (from *gi-ku nu-nir*), a weapon of the god Nebo, probably to be imagined in the shape of a dragon (cf. my *Grundriss*, p. 379, note 6).

¹ Cf. also my *Grundriss* (Munich, 1904), p. 184, A. 1.

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF REVELATION.

REVELATION XXII. 14.

'Blessed are they that wash their robes, that they may have the right to come to the tree of life, and may enter in by the gates into the city.'—R.V.

The first Beatitude that Jesus Christ spoke from the Mountain was, 'Blessed are the poor in spirit.' The last Beatitude that He speaks from heaven is, 'Blessed are they that wash their robes.' And the act commended in the last is but the outcome of the spirit extolled in the first. For they who are poor in spirit are such as know themselves to be sinful men; and those who know themselves to be sinful men are they who will cleanse their robes in the blood of Jesus Christ.

I always regard this as a test text. I should like to ask every Sunday-school teacher, every district visitor, every worker in an inquiry room, to take it, just as it stands, and expound it. And if he stumbles over it, or muddles it, I should like to send him back for a while to a form in God's school, there to learn Christ from Christ Himself, before he ventures to teach others. I said 'learn *Christ*'; not theologies, not systems of doctrine, but Christ. Christ is here in every word, Christ Jesus, God's Anointed Saviour of poor sinners; 'all and in all' to souls. If a man cannot preach Christ from this passage, He does not know the Gospel so as to be a fit teacher either of babes, or of strong men. It is not a difficult passage, if a man has first the root of the matter in him, and then has sat, as a little child, at the feet of the Holy Ghost to be taught, as He alone can teach, God's beautiful equipoise of truth.¹

The text tells us (1) who are the Blessed of the last Beatitude, and (2) what are their privileges. The Blessed are 'they that do his commandments,' or, as in the Revised Version, according to another reading, 'they that wash their robes.' Their privileges are right of access to the Tree of Life and entrance through the gates into the City.

I. The Blessed.

II. Their Privileges.

1. Entrance into the City.
2. Access to the Tree of Life.

I.

THE BLESSED.

We are face to face at once with a difficulty of reading. The A.V. has 'Blessed are they that do

¹ A. C. Price, *Fifty Sermons*, ii. 105.

his commandments,' following one reading; the R.V. 'Blessed are they that wash their robes,' following another. The difference, which seems so great in English, is due to the exchange of only a few letters in Greek. But the change from the Authorized Version to the Revised is generally hailed by expositors as a relief. 'Blessed are they that do his commandments,' says Maclaren,² 'carries us back to the old law, and has no more hopeful a sound in it than the thunders of Sinai. If it were, indeed, amongst Christ's last words to us, it would be a most sad instance of His 'building again the things he had destroyed.' It is relegating us to the dreary old round of trying to earn heaven by doing good deeds; and I might almost say it is 'making the Cross of Christ of none effect.' The fact that that corrupt reading came so soon into the Church and has held its ground so long, is to me a very singular proof of the difficulty which men have always had in keeping themselves up to the level of the grand central Gospel-truth: 'Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but by his mercy, he saved us.'

Dean Vaughan speaks even more strongly against the reading. If this is the saying of Christ, he says, we must bow to it. If it pleased Him to leave as His last word to the Churches this condemning sentence, it is not for us to remonstrate or to rebel. If it was the will of Christ to re-place His Church, by the very latest of His revelations, on a footing of meritorious obedience, it must be so, and, though with downcast looks and tottering steps, we must set ourselves to follow. Yet we cannot check the rising thought, 'We trusted that it had been he who should have redeemed man.'

But is there this difference between the readings? There is, and more than this difference, if they who 'do his commandments' have not yet 'washed their robes'; or if, to put it from the other side, the washing of the robes were not one of the commandments that had to be done, and indeed the sum and substance of them. It is quite true that our right of access to the Tree of Life is

² *A Year's Ministry*, 1st ser. 43.

not of works, but of grace; yet when we have been saved by grace we proceed to keep the commandments of God. This is the evidence of our salvation, and the enjoyment of it. 'If a man love me, he will keep my words'—that is doing His commandments—'and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him' (Jn 14²³)—that is enjoying access to the Tree of Life.

Swete has some difficulty in deciding between the readings. If the Greek letters were changed in the course of transcription, he thinks it slightly more probable that 'wash their robes' arose out of 'do his commandments' than that the reverse occurred. But the evidence of the documents is in favour of 'wash their robes'; and in the Johannine Writings the phrase is 'keep his commandments,' 'do' occurring only once, in 1 Jn 5². On the whole, then, he thinks, 'wash their robes' may with some confidence be preferred.

I. I need not remind you, I suppose, says Maclaren,¹ how continually this symbol of the robe is used in Scripture as an expression for moral character. This Book of the Apocalypse is saturated through and through with Jewish implications and allusions, and there can be no doubt whatever that in this metaphor of the cleansing of the robes there is an allusion to that vision which the Apocalyptic seer of the Old Covenant, the prophet Zechariah, had when he saw the High Priest standing before the altar clad in foul raiment, and the word came forth, 'Take away the filthy garments from him.' Nor need I do more than remind you how the same metaphor is often on the lips of our Lord Himself, notably in the story of the man that had not on the wedding garment, and in the touching and beautiful incident in the Parable of the Prodigal Son, where the exuberance of the father's love bids them cast the best robe round the rags and the leanness of his long-lost boy. Nor need I remind you how Paul catches up the metaphor, and is continually referring to an investing and a divesting—the putting on and the putting off of the new and the old man. In this same Book of the Apocalypse, we see, gleaming all through it, the white robes of the purified soul: 'They shall walk with me in white, for they are worthy.' 'I beheld a great multitude whom no man could number, who had washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb.'

All three made their way to the beautiful valley of Ivirna, where the lands of the chief Manaune were situated. The

welkin rang with merry shouts of *Kua tau mai Rori!* ('Rori is found!') The news spread all over the island the same day, so that crowds came to see this poor fellow. And a miserable skeleton he was, his skin almost black through continual exposure. A feast was made for him by the people of Ivirna, but he scarcely tasted the unaccustomed food. He was then led in procession round the island by his protector and others; the crowning point was for him to bathe in Rongo's Sacred Fountain, in token of his being cleansed from a state of bondage and fear, and being allowed to participate freely in all the good things of the dominant tribe.²

This mysterious robe, which answers nearly to what we mean by character, is made by the wearer. That is a solemn thought. Every one of us carries about with him a mystical loom, and we are always weaving—weave, weave, weaving—this robe which we wear, every thought a thread of the warp, every action a thread of the weft. 'We weave it, as the spider does its web, out of its own entrails, if I might so say. We weave it, and we dye it, and we cut it, and we stitch it, and then we put it on and wear it, and it sticks to us. Like a snail that crawls about your garden patches, and makes its shell by a process of secretion from out of its own substance, so you and I are making that mysterious thing that we call character, moment by moment. It is our own self, modified by our actions. Character is the precipitate from the stream of conduct which, like the Nile Delta, gradually rises solid and firm above the parent river and confines its flow.'³

2. The foul robes can be cleansed. Our text does not state the method. That has already been declared. 'They washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb' (7¹⁴). In his Epistle St. John has the same paradox: 'The blood of Jesus his Son cleanseth us from all sin' (1 Jn 1⁷). John saw the paradox, and he saw that the paradox helped to illustrate the great truth which he was trying to proclaim, that the red blood whitened the black robe, and that in its full tide there was a limpid river of water of life, clear as crystal, proceeding out of the Cross of Christ.

3. But it is not a past washing only that is spoken of here. It is also a daily washing of the robes of the redeemed even now. It is not, 'Blessed are they that have washed.' The Greek is the perpetual present—'Blessed are they that keep washing.' Having once washed the whole body in the fountain opened for sin and for uncleanness, they have need constantly to wash the feet, soiled afterwards, and again and again, by contact with the dust and the miry clay of this world. 'Blessed are they that evermore wash their robes,' by an ever-repeated application of the

² Gill, *From Darkness to Light in Polynesia*, p. 234.

³ A. Maclaren, *ibid.* 46.

¹ *A Year's Ministry*, 1st ser. 45.

'blood of sprinkling' alike to the accusing conscience and to the sin-stained life.

It is a most dangerous thing to fall into the habit of letting any committed sin pass *sub silentio* (as it were) between man and his soul. Scripture indeed counsels no morbid self-scrutiny. Harm may be done by it. A man may walk timidly and slavishly before God by reason of it. We are not taught that many express words, or perhaps any express words, need pass about particular wrong thoughts, acts, or words, in direct converse on the subject between God and the soul. But if so, it must be because the intercourse is so thorough that it need not be microscopic. The man does not wash each separate spot and stain, because he washes the whole robe, and them with it. One way or another, the tablets of memory and the tablets of conscience and the tablets of life must be sponged clean every evening—and in only one way, by what Scripture calls 'the blood of the Lamb'—that is, the Atonement made once for all for all sin, applied in earnest faith to the individual man's heart and soul in the sight of God.¹

I have been told that in this district in days gone by, those who were communicants of the Church might be known by the 'washings' on the ropes in their greens, or, if they had no greens, on the dykes and hedges near their houses on the week before the communion Sabbath. And on one communion Sabbath morning, as I had occasion to go over the dewy fields very early, I met a working man near a rock in the middle of a field well away from the town, to whom I said, when I came up to him, 'Dear me, James, you are early about.' To which he replied, 'Ay, I always come out at sunrise on the communion Sunday to prepare'; and then something told me quite plainly that he had been at prayer at the rock-side before I had appeared.²

4. The washing of their robes is done by the Blessed themselves. 'Blessed are they that wash their robes.' On the one hand is all the fulness of cleansing; on the other is the heap of dirty rags that will not be cleansed by you sitting there and looking at them. The two must be brought into contact. How? By the magic band that unites strength and weakness, purity and foulness, the Saviour and the penitent; the magic band of simple affiance, and trust and submission to the cleansing power of His death and of His life.

Six centuries ago there lived a youth of almost intolerable arrogance, arising from a sense of his own superiority, who, thwarted in love, thwarted in ambition, thwarted in every lofty aim for his country, beguiled by the dazzling wild beast of impurity, tempted by the gaunt wolf of avarice, torn by the lion of fierce anger, trying in vain to save himself by external conformity and by donning the girdle of a Franciscan Tertiary, eating the bitter bread of exile, and swallowing the salt tears of infinite disappointment, felt even in middle

life that he had lost his way completely in the wild and savage forest, and could not reach the sunny hill of moral order and holiness. Yet he, too, taught by the grace of God to face the eternal realities, to see the things that are, and to see them as they are, see sin as it is and himself as he was, did climb strugglingly by the steep hill of penitence, and pass through the purifying flame, and became the greatest singer of the Christian Church—the mighty Dante.³

II.

THEIR PRIVILEGES.

Their privileges are two: Right to come to the Tree of Life and Entrance into the City. Now the Tree of Life is in the midst of the Paradise of God, and the Paradise is in the centre of the City of God. So we come first through the gates into the City.

I. Entrance into the City. The City is the society of the Redeemed. In relation to Christ it is spoken of as a Bride. In relation to the followers of Christ themselves as a City, the City in which they dwell together.

In the old world the whole power and splendour of great kingdoms was gathered in their capitals, Babylon and Nineveh in the past, Rome in the present. To John the forces of evil were all concentrated in that city on the Seven Hills. To him the antagonistic forces which were the hope of the world were all concentrated in the real ideal city which he expected to come down from heaven—the New Jerusalem.

What are the characteristics of this city of God into which the Blessed of the last Beatitude enter?

1. *It is a City of Social Activities.* Genesis began with a garden, man's sin sent him out of the garden. God out of evil evolves good, and for the lost garden comes the better thing, the found city. 'Then comes the statelier Eden back to man.' For surely it is better that men should live in the activities of the city than in the sweetness and indolence of the garden; and manifold and miserable as are the sins and the sorrows of great cities, the opprobria of our modern so-called civilization, yet still the aggregation of great masses of men for worthy objects generates a form of character, and sets loose energies and activities, which no other kind of life could have produced.

Paradise Lost was a garden, Paradise Regained is a city. Whatever else there was in the one, of beauty, of glory, it was a self-life. All was there, if not of luxury, if not of

¹ C. J. Vaughan, *Authorized or Revised?* 303.

² Donald M. Henry, *Whithorn*.

³ F. W. Farrar, in the *Christian World Pulpit*, xxxvii. 66.

indolence, yet at least of enjoyment and of isolation. There were no sights or sounds of distress, to evoke the nobler feelings of pity and sympathy, or the nobler activities of helping and ministering. Even the spiritual life of Paradise, if we may not with reverence speak of it as selfish, was yet a life self-concentrated and self-contained, redeemed only from an unlovely exclusiveness, on the one side by there being none to shut out, on the other side by its being lived in the light of a God of Love. Not until sin entered, and death by sin, was there either the family to evoke charity, or the Church to exercise communion.¹

2. *It is a City of Reunion.* Scripture leads us to associate the reunion of dead and living in a world from which all idolatry and all selfishness will have been for ever cast out by the unveiled presence of that one Person whom to know is life, whom to serve is glory. St. Paul used to speak of meeting there his own converts, Asiatic and European, and seemed to say that it would scarcely be heaven to him if they shared it not with him. 'He that raised up the Lord Jesus shall raise up us also by Jesus, and shall present us—with you.' 'What is our glory or joy or crown of rejoicing? Are not even ye in the presence of our Lord Jesus Christ at His coming?' So large was his conception of the amplitude of the glory, and of its characteristic features of human sympathy as well as of Divine communion.

Surely there, amidst the solemn troops and sweet societies, the long-loved, long-lost, will be found again. I cannot believe that, like the Virgin and Joseph, we shall have to go wandering up and down the streets of Jerusalem when we get there, looking for our dear ones. 'Wist ye not that I should be in the Father's house?' We shall know where to find them.

We shall clasp them again,
And with God be the rest.²

3. *It is a City of Abiding.* The city is the emblem of security and of permanence. No more shall life be as a desert march, with changes which only bring sorrow, and yet a dreary monotony amidst them all. We shall dwell amid abiding realities, ourselves fixed in unchanging, but ever growing completeness and peace. The tents shall be done with, we shall inhabit the solid mansions of the city which hath foundations, and shall wonderingly exclaim, as our unaccustomed eyes gaze on their indestructible strength, 'What manner of stones, and what buildings are here!'—and not one stone of these shall ever be thrown down.

¹ C. J. Vaughan, *Authorized or Revised?* 307.

² A. Maclaren, *A Year's Ministry*, 1st ser. 52.

2. *Access to the Tree.* As the City is social, the Tree of Life is individual. In the City we enjoy the society of the Redeemed; at the Tree of Life we enjoy fellowship with God, a fellowship which is the peculiar privilege of each one of those who have washed their robes. We receive a name which no one knows except the Giver and the receiver of it. The promise is particular: 'If a man love me, he will keep my words: and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him.'

The tree of life stands out in the first pages of God's word as a sacramental symbol to unfallen man. It was a visible and tangible thing—a tree growing in the garden like other trees, but so inscribed with the word of God that in the use of its fruit, unfallen man could receive the spiritual assurance of God's love and favour. In this respect it differed from the other trees of the garden: they were God's permitted gifts to satisfy man's animal wants; but the tree of life has regard to the higher needs of his spiritual nature, which even then had a genuine sacramental instinct, and hungered for some tangible assurance of God's abiding grace.

When Adam sinned, the way to the tree of life was no longer open to him; and this healthful sacrament became at once forbidden fruit. In very mercy its use was forbidden to him, and put beyond his reach. Evidently its withdrawal has a peculiar solemnity about it: it is to save man from a fresh blunder and a new sin. The dream—that if only, by any means, he could retain the coveted assurance of God's love, all would be well, and all his disobedience would be neutralized, and all his sin forgotten—must at once be rudely broken. Even more than that, there is a dreadful possibility of his destroying all hope of restoration, if he rush in and claim the old symbol of God's love. For him to feed on the tree of life, when in a state of sin and anger and shame, would practically mean a second death.

But when we have washed our robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb, we have again as good a fitness to approach the Tree of Life as in primeval innocence. It is our fitness that constitutes our right. It is in being cleansed that the new right to come and eat is valid. Not unsullied innocence itself can come with surer step

to have the bread of God's own life given to it, than impurity that has been graciously cleansed away. The pardoned rebel, in his robes washed white, has a title to life as good as the angels, who have never defiled their garments.¹

‘I am going to a city
Where the living never die,
Where no sickness and no sorrow can molest;
From this body to release me
He is speeding from on high;
He will greet me and escort me to my rest.’

Charles M. Alexander, the singer-evangelist, once told the following story of the origin of the hymn of which the above is the chorus:—

‘I always like to know how hymns came to be written, and so I asked the man who wrote this hymn how he came to do so. He told me that a friend of his went from New York City to the country. He was far gone in consumption, but in the deceptive nature of the disease thought that he was growing better day by day, till one morning he said he was so much improved in health that he was returning to the city the next day. The writer of the hymn went to see him in the afternoon, and found him in bed again. “Why,” he said, “I thought you were going to the city to-morrow?” The sick man’s face lighted up, and he answered, “I’m going to a city, but it is a city where the living never die, and where no sickness and no sorrow can come.” After his death, his friend, remembering his words, wrote this hymn.’

1. Access to the Tree of Life is a matter of *right*, not of *reward*.

This we might illustrate by reference to the case of a pupil who is being promoted from a school of one grade to a school that is of a grade higher. He is promoted, not for the purpose of rewarding him for the faithful work he has done in the inferior grades, but because the superior grade is the place for him. He has acquired the ‘*right*’ to a place in that grade. That pupils are sometimes promoted before they have acquired the right, and prematurely advanced out of considerations of favouritism, is undoubtedly the fact, but advancement on such grounds invalidates the whole scheme of promotion and, in all ordinary relations,—in everything, I mean, except in religion,—is amenable to universal disapproval. Whether in schools or in matters of civil service, individual merit is regarded as the essential condition of candidature; and to set up some other principle of preference in matters of the future world, and to assume that there is some other legitimate title to the tree of life besides simple individual *right* to the tree of life, and *right* to a residence in the celestial city, is to break with what we all recognize as justice in affairs of mundane experience, and to let our future condition be decided by a so-called system of divine determination too arbitrary and evasive to be tolerated by any reputable human civil service commission. If, then, the pupil is promoted, it is not to reward him for his work; and if he is not promoted, it is not to punish him for his lack of work.

There is a place where he belongs, and in any well-regulated system of school administration the place where he belongs is the place where he will be kept or put.²

2. But if the right is more minutely examined, it will be found to be—(1) *A right of Promise*. ‘This is the promise which he promised us, even the life eternal’ (1 Jn 2²⁵). The promise is made sure by the washing of the robes in the blood of the Lamb. ‘For how many soever be the promises of God, in him is the yea: wherefore also through him is the Amen (2 Co 1²⁰).

(2) *A right of Inheritance*. ‘As many as received him, to them gave he the right to become children of God’ (Jn 1¹²). And this Johannine assurance is confirmed by St. Paul: ‘Ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus’ (Gal 3²⁶). ‘And if children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ (Ro 8¹⁷).

(3) *A right of Fitness*. This is the special right of the text, and it is as sure as the others, however astonishing that may be. ‘Made fit for the inheritance of the saints in light’—that is one thing. That is the entrance which is abundantly ministered unto us through the gates into the city. Fitness also for fellowship so close and intimate that because He lives we live also; and that ‘I live, and yet no longer I, but Christ liveth in me.’ That is the right to the Tree of Life.

Of all the tombs in Westminster Abbey, few are more interesting than that of our bright hero, King Henry .v. His youth, too, was spent in idle noise, among drunken and debauched companions, but when, in our Jerusalem Chamber by the bedside of his dying father, his heart was touched for the first time by the grace of God, when from a frivolous and dissolute youth he went forth a king, not only in power, but in character, we know how he flung off his old follies and his old sins, and said to the obscene companion of his youth:

‘I know thee not, old man: fall to thy prayers;
How ill white hairs become a fool and jester!
I have long dream’d of such a kind of man,
So surfeit-swell’d, so old and so profane;
But, being awaked, I do despise my dream.
Reply not to me with a fool-born jest:
Presume not that I am the thing I was;
For God doth know, so shall the world perceive,
That I have turn’d away my former self;
So will I those that keep me company.’

If this be in part only traditional, yet when you look upon his stately tomb in the Confessor’s Chapel, on the frieze that ornaments it, between the swans and antelopes of the De Bohuns you see a flaming beacon or cresset-light, which he took for his badge, ‘showing thereby,’ says an old

¹ R. Waterston, *Thoughts on the Lord’s Supper*, 23.

² C. H. Parkhurst, *A Little Lower than the Angels*, 85.

chronicler, 'that although his virtues had been formerly obscured, and lay as a dead coal, waiting for light to kindle it, by reason of tender years and evil company, notwithstanding he being now come to perfecter years and to riper understanding, had shaken off his evil counsellors, and his virtues now shine forth as a light of a cresset, which is

no ordinary light.' And you know how on his early death-bed he was heard again and again to cry aloud, as if defying the evil spirit of his youth: 'Thou liest! thou liest! my part is with my Lord Jesus Christ!'¹

¹ F. W. Farrar, *ibid.* 67.

Recent Oriental Archaeology.

By A. H. SAYCE, D.D., LL.D., PROFESSOR OF ASSYRIOLOGY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD.

ONE of the most important works that have appeared of late years on the archæology of the ancient East is a large volume on *The Seal-Cylinders of Western Asia*, by Dr. Hayes Ward, published by the Carnegie Institution at Washington (1910). The author has made the subject peculiarly his own, and his book embodies the results of almost a lifetime's study. He has prepared the way for it by his work on the seal-cylinders in Mr. Pierpont Morgan's magnificent collection, some account of which has already been given in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES. In the present volume no less than 1315 seal-cylinders are reproduced.

For a knowledge of the mythology, religious beliefs and practices, and artistic development of early Babylonia and the countries dependent on Babylonian culture, the seal-cylinders are invaluable. But the study of them has been attended with many difficulties. It is seldom that the inscriptions which often accompany the designs throw any light upon the meaning of the latter, and the signification of the designs themselves is frequently very obscure. It is only by the use of the scientific instrument of comparison that in many cases their signification has been arrived at, and comparison needs the collection of a large number of examples before it acquires scientific value. In the course of his researches, Dr. Hayes Ward has made many discoveries, and the classes into which he has succeeded in separating the cylinders and the designs upon them, as well as the explanations he has given of them, will render his book a standard authority for many years to come.

The Syro-Hittite cylinders, of which he finds several different types, have evidently specially attracted him, and his chapters upon them are not

the least valuable in his book. They open up a new and very interesting line of study, and will help to throw light on the early relations between Babylonia, the original home of the seal-cylinder, on the one side, and the Amorites of Syria and the Hittites of Asia Minor, on the other. As far back as the copper age the seal-cylinder found its way both to Cyprus and to Troy, and it had been domesticated in Egypt long before the rise of the First Dynasty. A comparison between the seal-cylinders found in these countries with those of Babylonia ought to show to what period in Babylonian history the migration of the seal-cylinder to the West must be assigned. In Cyprus and Egypt, at any rate, it was before the age of the dynasties of Ur or of Khammu-rabi, if not before the age of Sargon of Akkad; the seal-cylinders hitherto discovered in the Hittite region indicate, on the other hand, the period of Khammu-rabi.

It is a pity that Dr. Hayes Ward was unable to give photographic reproductions of the cylinders; copies made by the hand are not always trustworthy, especially where cuneiform characters are attempted to be drawn by persons who are unacquainted with them. The actual reading of certain inscriptions, for instance, on the Syro-Hittite cylinders could never be ascertained from the printed copies of them. I could wish, too, that the book had been provided with an index.

The Abbé Martin's Assyriological work is always distinguished by careful scholarship, and his latest book¹ is a valuable addition to Assyrian philology. It is occupied with the letters dated in the reigns of Nabonidos, Cyrus, Darius, and Cambyes, which have been published by the authorities of the

¹ *Lettres néo-babyloniennes*, by Fr. Martin. Paris: Champion, 1909.

British Museum in the 22nd Part of *Cuneiform Texts*. Most of the letters in this collection are, unfortunately, of little or no interest, and the Abbé has therefore been well advised to edit only a selection from them. Those which he has translated throw light on the daily life of the Babylonian people in the age of the Persian conquest, and show how like it was to that of most Oriental peoples to-day. There was the same oppression by the officials, whether religious or civil, the same unavailing complaints by the victims, and the same jealousies and defamations of character. The High Priest of Sippara, as M. Martin observes, appears in a particularly bad light: 'One of his subordinates is forced to keep the royal horses at his own expense; another, a scribe, he refuses to pay for work done; he interferes in judicial affairs, and is not afraid to extend his protection to a murderer.'

The three most important and interesting letters in the collection are two from a Babylonian officer who apparently commanded the Babylonian forces in the war against Assyria which led to the fall of Nineveh, and a third from an Assyrian king to an official in Babylonia ordering him to send to Nineveh certain tablets which were to be found in the library of the temple at Borsippa as well as in the private libraries of certain individuals there. Unfortunately, all three documents are much mutilated: even as it is, they give us a good deal of welcome information. I must not part from the Abbé Martin without mentioning that he has added a very useful glossary of words to his book.

Professor Prášek has now published the second and concluding volume of his exhaustive work on the history of the Medes and Persians.¹ It is a volume of which he may well be proud. It has been brought thoroughly up to date, and the philological allusions in it have been revised by Dr. Hoffmann-Kutschke, thus ensuring their agreement with the latest results of philological research. Everywhere there is evidence of careful investigation and sound judgment; no authority has been overlooked, and the references are quite a marvel of completeness. The student of ancient history is now in possession of all that is known up to the present of that portion of Persian history which is

so important for understanding the later books of the Old Testament. Use has naturally been made of the Assuan papyri, and the admirable index at the end is worthy of the book.

Professor Hilprecht's latest work has an interest much beyond that of a merely Assyriological publication.² Among the cuneiform tablets from the library, or libraries, of the ancient Nippur which have been recently examined are some of exceptional interest. Besides lists of cuneiform signs and proper names, grammatical treatises in Sumerian and Semitic, geographical and similar lists, lists of weights and measures, months and dates, medical prescriptions, hymns, prayers and liturgies, mathematical and astronomical texts, there are also historical documents, as well as chronological tables. They have come from the site known as 'Tablet Hill,' which Professor Hilprecht believes to have been ruined at the time of the Elamite invasion of Babylonia in the age of Khammu-rabi and Rim-Sin. At all events, between this period and that of the Kassite king Burna-buryas (1400 B.C.) there is a break in the history of Nippur: no tablets are met with, and in the Kassite age which followed the restoration of the temple by Burna-buryas the library seems to have been transferred to the western side of the Shatt en-Nil.

Most of the texts from 'Tablet Hill' are written in Sumerian, but two were found last autumn by Professor Hilprecht, and pieced together from a number of fragments, which are in Semitic Babylonian. One of these is a record of a hitherto unknown king of Gutium or Kurdistan—the Goyim of Genesis—whose name is read Erridu-pizir by the discoverer. As he calls himself king 'of the four quarters of the world,' like Sargon of Akkad, Erridu-pizir must have been a great conqueror, and have claimed universal dominion. Professor Hilprecht believes that the capture and sack of Nippur which is described in so many songs of lamentation was his doing.

The second text is still more interesting, as it is a fragment of an early version of the Deluge story. Unfortunately, the discovery of it has aroused a considerable amount of acrimonious and not alto-

¹ *Geschichte der Meder und Perser bis zur makedonischen Eroberung*, by J. V. Prášek. Gotha: Perthes, 1910.

² *The Babylonian Expedition of the University of Pennsylvania*, vol. v. part 1. *The Earliest Version of the Babylonian Deluge Story and the Temple Library of Nippur*, by H. V. Hilprecht. Philadelphia, 1910.

gether fair controversy in America, with which we on this side of the Atlantic have no concern. Professor Hilprecht, however, laid himself open to attack by claiming for his text that it was not only an early version, but the earliest at present known. But this cannot be proved, as it is undated, and the forms of the characters are not older than the close of the Khammu-rabi period, while a fragment of a version discovered by Professor Scheil a few years ago is actually dated in the reign of the fourth successor of Khammu-rabi. Moreover, it must be remembered that the well-known version of the story discovered by George Smith goes back, like the epic in which it is embodied, to the Khammu-rabi age, though the edition of it which has come down to us belongs to the time of Assur-bani-pal.

The new text is but a fragment, and the translation of what remains, therefore, is not always very easy. I cannot follow Professor Hilprecht in reading what is left of line 12 (. . . *ku um mi ni*) as *kum mini* 'instead of a number,' though I am unable to suggest any alternative rendering. At all events, I do not know what he could be thinking of in proposing to translate the biblical

Emînêhu 'instead of a number'; the Hebrew words could never mean this.

But I am at one with him in holding that the Babylonian story of the Deluge, with its close approximation to the language of Genesis, was known to the Hebrews before the Mosaic age, and I cannot do better than quote some of his concluding words: 'There remains no other period to be considered when the oldest version of the Deluge story could possibly have entered Canaan than the time when Abraham, whom I regard as a truly historical person, left his home on the Euphrates and moved westward; in other words, the period of the first dynasties of Isin and Babylon, of which Khammu-rabi or Amraphel is the central figure. This is the time when the Amorites knocked at the gates of Babylonia, invaded the country, and soon overthrew the old order of things, at the same time getting themselves intimately acquainted with Babylonian literature and civilization, which they finally accepted.' Abraham was an Amorite in the Babylonian acceptance of the name, and, as one of the upper classes, would have been educated in the learning of the Babylonians.

The Authorities for the Institution of the Eucharist.

BY PROFESSOR SIR W. M. RAMSAY, D.D., LL.D., D.C.L., ABERDEEN.

PART IV.

On the theory above stated about Luke's two authorities, we assume that there was some considerable difference between them in word, but not in fact. The contemporary authority (lost, except as Luke preserves it) mentioned words that were not taken into the Church Rite, and there is a noteworthy difference between Mark and Luke as to the words spoken after the Cup, about which I do not venture to make any suggestion. But with regard to the general fact of difference between the two authorities, it is sufficient to prove their absolute independence of one another, but not sufficient to show any inconsistency or contradiction. Rather, it amounts simply to the degree of difference that will always be found between two witnesses reporting without mutual consultation part of the words and acts of a

rather complicated incident. According to our view, the difference would probably have been greater, had it not been for the influence of the Church Rite, which preserved the memory of the central and most important part of the whole series of acts and words.

The variation in form between Lk 22^{16,18}, parallel as they are in most respects, is also highly important: 'I say unto you, I will not eat (this Passover), until,' etc., and, 'I say unto you, I will not drink from henceforth of the fruit of the vine, until,' etc. Jesus, as we know, ate the meal, and did not merely give to the disciples to eat, but He did not eat this Passover. Hence, while eating the meal, He says, 'I will not eat the passover, until.' . . . On the other hand, in respect of the wine, which formed no part of the Passover, He

says, 'I will not after this occasion drink until the kingdom of God shall come' (or, as Mark has it, 'until that day when I drink it new in the kingdom of God'). The variation between the two sayings in Luke seems certainly original; yet it appears not to have been understood and to have been the cause of some difficulty to the earliest historians.

Some minor divergences in the details may be noted. Luke says, 'divide it amongst yourselves,' while Matthew has 'drink ye all of it.' The difference in the verb is doubtless due to varying translations of the Aramaic word used by the Saviour.¹ Mark, on the other hand, changes the imperative to the indicative, 'and they all drank of it': it seems beyond question that here Luke and Matthew preserve the truer form; but the command was followed by the act: some give the command, Mark mentions the act; but each implies the other, and it was sufficient to mention either alone. The divergence between 'shed for many'² and 'for you,' though slight, is not easy to explain satisfactorily, though one might easily suggest possible theories. The command respecting the Cup, 'Take this: Divide it among yourselves' (or, 'Drink ye all of it'), is doubtless original; but being as a repetition unnecessary, it was shortened by Mark and Matthew, and omitted in the Church ceremony so far as reported by Luke and Paul. It was necessary in the original action, because there was an interval between the two acts, the Bread and the Cup (as the expression of Luke shows 'after supper,' referring to the time when the wine was ordinarily served after the conclusion of the meal). When the two acts follow immediately one on the other, as in the ceremony, it was unnecessary to repeat the command.

It is needless to say that we must wholly and absolutely reject any theory which assumes that Luke had only Mark as an authority, and that divergences from Mark are to be explained as interpolations made in his text on the authority of Paul's account in First Corinthians. No such theory is sufficient; for it affords no explanation

of the prophecy regarding the Passover which Luke, and Luke alone, records; and in other respects it fails to explain the literary facts.

As there are two accounts which we have found united by Luke, we might perhaps expect that he would put first that which he took as the standard, namely, vv.^{19, 20}, and afterwards append the subsidiary account so far as he retained it. Such was the case in the Old Syriac Version of the Sinaitic Codex (recovered and published by Mrs. Lewis and Mrs. Gibson). Now the Sinaitic Syriac seems undoubtedly to carry us back to a text of Luke existing in the second century: it reveals to us, therefore, an older form of the text than any other authority exhibits. Can we then infer that it gives us the true, original Lucan order, which has been disturbed in the Greek? This is improbable for two reasons: (1) No explanation can account for the change from Sinaitic order to the Greek, if the Sinaitic was original; but there was great temptation to change the Greek order into the Sinaitic, if the Greek was original. (2) The Sinaitic order is not got merely by a simple transposition; it breaks up the two accounts, and mixes them: in short, it is conflate and secondary, while the Greek, in comparison, is primary.

But the great value of the Sinaitic Text in this passage lies herein. It proves, in the first place, that the whole of the second account, as given in vv.^{19, 20}, was in the Greek text from which the Sinaitic Syriac was translated in the second century; and disproves beyond reasonable question the theory, already utterly improbable on many grounds that the Bezan Text is right in leaving out vv.^{19b, 20}. In the second place, the Sinaitic Syriac Text takes us into the midst of the work and thought which were being applied during the second century in the Churches from Antioch to Ephesus to the study of the New Testament, and to the modernization and adaptation of the language of the historical books to the practical needs of the time. The process is precisely the same as we find to have been carried out in the Bezan Texts of *Acts*³ on a far greater scale.

¹ It is not necessary in a case like this to have recourse to the fashionable theory that Luke misread an Aramaic word. Independent renderings of the same words are quite sufficient to account for the facts.

² Matthew's addition 'for remission of sins' is probably explanatory, and not true to the original.

³ According to the writer's theory (often misstated by its critics) that the Bezan Text of *Acts* is largely a modernization; but it is founded on a far earlier and in some ways better copy of the book than survives in any MS., and therefore in some cases preserves, or points the way to, a better text than any which we now possess.

The Sinaitic translator (probably working in Antioch) either used a Greek MS. in which already the text had been transposed and remodelled, or he transposed as he translated: the former is the more natural and probable course: the translator merely translated, and we must dismiss as unlikely the other supposition that the translator himself made the transposition. Moreover, the Bezan Revision seems to have been founded on a Text in which the transposition had already been accomplished; and there can hardly be any doubt that the old Text which lies behind that Revision was Greek and of date not later than the second century.

The Bezan editor was also displeased with the account. The double Cup offended him most, and he dropped out the second Cup, leaving the wrong order. Then the process was carried further: the Cup was transposed to follow the Bread, which (owing to the omission) was now possible in a simple way; and this form of text occurs in a very few MSS. The Sinaitic Syriac carries us back to a MS. in which the Bezan omission had not been made.

Our theory, then, as to Luke's authorities at this point, is that he had before him, first, Mark, whose account he regarded as being, not incorrect, but secondary; secondly, the Church Rite, as he had seen it all over the Christian world, everywhere similar;¹ thirdly, a narrative contemporary (as I believe), coming from one of those who were present. But even this last account, though he preserved from it something which was not taken into the Church Rite, was treated by him as subsidiary, and the Rite was the prime authority.

We do not here follow the usual procedure in comparing the Third Gospel with the First and Second. The general procedure is to take everything in the entire Lucan passage that agrees with the accounts of Matthew and Mark as adopted from the common Synoptist source. It then becomes an insoluble puzzle why Luke should put the Cup before the Bread, contrary to the unanimous

tradition, and the undoubted order in the rite as actually celebrated.

But it is, of course, certain that in all accounts from every source there would be much agreement. Therefore we must not assume that everything in Luke's account which agrees with Matthew and Mark is derived from a common source. Rather we hold that in both Luke's authorities the order was, first Bread, then Cup; and that excision from the first authority produces the appearance that he gives the reverse order. A too eager desire to be careful, and not to lose any important detail, or to alter any transmitted word,² has introduced some confusion into his account.

VI. At this point it will be useful to mention the account given by Justin Martyr of the sacrament as it was celebrated in his time. His conversion to Christianity occurred somewhere under Hadrian's reign, *i.e.* between 117 and 138 A.D.; and therefore his knowledge of the form in which the Rite was celebrated goes back to that time, since it is evident that he was unconscious of any change having taken place in the ceremonial during his own time, and that he confidently regarded the forms as having come down unchanged from the time of the Apostles, *i.e.* from the original institution by the Lord. His evidence is valuable, because he gives both a brief account of the ceremonial as it actually was performed in the Church during his experience and a rough quotation of the record of the Apostles: οἱ γὰρ ἀπόστολοι ἐν τοῖς γενομένοις ὑπ' αὐτῶν ἀπομνημονεύμασιν, ἃ καλεῖται εὐαγγέλια, οὕτως παρέδωκαν ἐντετάλθαι αὐτοῖς τὸν Ἰησοῦν λαβόντα ἄρτον εὐχαριστήσαντα εἰπεῖν· 'τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἀνάμνησίν μου, τοῦτο ἐστὶ τὸ σῶμα μου.' καὶ τὸ ποτήριον ὁμοίως λαβόντα καὶ εὐχαριστήσαντα εἰπεῖν· 'τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ αἷμά μου.' He regarded this Apostolic record as corresponding in every essential to the ceremony as he knew it in the Church.

In the first place, as to what Justin meant by the Gospels, I think that after much discussion it has now come to be generally accepted that the four canonical Gospels were in existence in his time; and they were therefore meant by him here. It does not follow that he thought all four were written by Apostles; but he took them all as being record of Apostolic authority, and two at least as being

¹ His thought is exactly the same in character as that which was expressed about 192 A.D. by Avircius, Presbyter-Bishop of Hieropolis in Phrygia (St. Abercius), who describes his travels to Rome on the west, to Nisibis beyond Euphrates on the east, and adds, 'Everywhere I found pledged Brethren,' adding a veiled account of the Rite of the sacred meal, the Fish (*i.e.* Christ) and the Wine, the mixed cup according to the ordinary ancient custom of giving mixed, not pure wine.

² To omit part of an authority was not the same as altering it. Omission was freely practised, and was often regarded as right.

actually the work of Apostles. In this case he has in mind the Synoptists. His quotation is only from memory; and it gives in a shortened form the substance of the three accounts which we have. Evidently he thinks of Luke especially. He uses, like Luke, the word 'thank,' not 'bless' (as Mark and Matthew do): he mentions the order to 'do this in remembrance of me,' which Luke alone records; and he uses the phrase 'in like manner,' when he mentions the Cup, implying a repetition of acts and words, as Luke does (but not the other two); though *ὁμοίως* occurs to his memory in place of the synonym *ὡσαύτως*, which is Luke's word. He therefore was acquainted with the longer form of Luke's narrative, and not the shorter Western texts, for it seems quite unreasonable to suppose that he followed Paul in preference to the Gospels, summing up loosely an Epistle of Paul among the *ἀπομνημονεύματα* called *εὐαγγέλια*.

In the next place, he regarded the varying accounts given by the Synoptists as in essential agreement with one another. He quotes Luke as approaching most closely to the actual Church Rite; but, with the Rite in his memory as a guide, he saw no practical difference between the various accounts. Such is the real fact. The three accounts, when understood in connexion with the Rite, are in perfect agreement; they do not choose the same details for record, but they all imply the same series of acts and words, for the details which they mention require inexorably that the other details, which they omit, must take place. Even the command, 'do this in memory of me,' is, as we saw, presupposed in the narrative of Matthew and Mark and taken for granted as familiar to all. What they record loses almost all its importance, unless it were intended (as Paul says it was) to be the institution of a Rite for future repetition. Hence Justin says that, according to the Apostolic tradition in the Gospels, the command was issued (to do as the Church habitually did): he considers that this command is implied in all the accounts, though he expresses his informal quotation on the lines of Luke, as giving the clearest statement. The account of Matthew and Mark becomes intelligible only through its historic character as the expression of the reason for, and as hinting at the truth embodied in, an established custom of the early Church.

In the third place, Justin clearly distinguishes between the Rite and the Apostolic narratives.

He describes the Rite in chap. 65 of his first Apology, and in the following chapter he quotes the narratives as the justification and explanation of the Rite. The narratives are accounts of the historical facts, out of which the Rite originated. They were written by authors who were familiar with the Rite, and who wrote for readers that were familiar with it; and those authors had always an eye to the ceremonial of the Rite, but still they were not describing the Rite: they were describing its historical origin in certain actions of the Lord. This is extremely important in its bearing on their value as historical authorities.

Justin, unfortunately, does not describe so fully as we should wish, the ceremonial of the Rite, nor the words uttered by the celebrant ('him who was the leader among the Brethren,' τῷ προεστῶτι τῶν ἀδελφῶν); but it is interesting to observe two things: (1) The celebrant used words which explain the divergence between Luke on the one hand, and Mark with Matthew on the other hand, as to the opening words. Luke speaks of 'giving thanks,' Mark and Matthew of 'blessing.' Justin says that the celebrant first 'sends up praise and glory to the Father,' etc., and then 'makes a thanksgiving' (εὐχαριστίαν . . . ποιῆται); the first stage corresponds better to the Marcan term 'bless,' the second to the Lucan term 'give thanks'; and it is clear that (as was stated in an earlier paragraph) both terms are correct descriptions of the words used by Jesus on the historic occasion, and repeated in every celebration of the Rite.

(2) Justin also makes it quite clear that the celebrant spoke at some considerable length. We cannot doubt that much which he said was traditional, being the stereotyped and prescribed repetition of the original words. The proof seems complete that (as we have assumed above) Jesus spoke at far greater length than the Synoptists record. They give only a very brief statement of what they considered the most important details; and no two persons will ever agree exactly in giving a short résumé of the most important points of a series of acts and words. Matthew, though at this point repeating Mark, modifies him in certain points; and we must hold (as above stated) that he did so with the intention of improving him and making his narrative correspond more closely with the Rite.

After all is said, the ceremony as performed in

the early Church stands out more and more prominently as the best and the chief and the sufficient authority for the original facts. Such must be the historian's judgment.

We notice that Justin uses the same word as Paul about the transmission of the record: the Apostles *παρέδωκαν*, 'handed on the record that an order was given to them.' Similarly, Paul says *παρέδωκα ὑμῖν*, 'I have handed on the record to you Corinthians.' The trustworthiness of the tradition originating from historical facts and from the words and actions of the Lord is assumed by both writers as the fundamental truth in this matter.

It should not be left out of notice that Justin knew the Rite to be celebrated with the mixed Cup, water and wine (just as Avircius Marcellus in his epitaph, about thirty years later than Justin's death, mentions the *κέραςμα μετ' ἄρτον*). We cannot, on the principles which guide this investigation, doubt that such was the original form and the fact of the Last Supper; but this is probably to be attributed not to any mystic or hieratic intention, but to the regular and usual custom of the time. The Last Supper was an ordinary meal, which became epoch-making in its consequences and accompaniments; it was served in the customary fashion, with wine after the food had been eaten: this wine was mixed with water, because that was the invariable usage (except among persons who intended to become excited and intoxicated).

Now, according to the fashion which we see acting so effectively in the records, namely, that a series of associated acts might be briefly summed

up by mentioning any one of them (as, for example, the Sacrament might be called either the Breaking of the Bread, which is usual, or, for some special reason on a special occasion, the Cup), it was evidently quite possible and natural that the mixed cup of the Rite might be called either the Wine or the Water, or the mixture. Justin exemplifies all these ways of speaking: he calls it first *ποτήριον ὕδατος καὶ κράματος*, where the water is most prominently mentioned, and the wine is implied (but not expressly mentioned) in *κράματος*: later he speaks of it as *οἶνον καὶ ὕδατος*, where the wine is most prominent: later he calls it in quotation simply *ποτήριον*: finally, where he asserts that the Rite has been imitated in the Mithraic religion, he speaks of *ποτήριον ὕδατος* alone, because the Mithraic rite was celebrated with water only, and yet Justin regarded this as mimicry of the Christian Rite.

It is necessary, therefore, to avoid laying any stress on occasions where water alone is mentioned, or wine alone, as if the early Rite was celebrated with either liquid singly. Doubtless there would have been no difficulty felt in celebrating the Rite with one alone, if the other were not easily procurable: the early Church laid no stress on such petty details, it was the spirit and the general effect, not the material, that was important. But the proper and original form was the mixed Cup; and it is wrong to attempt to press and force testimony into conformity with any theory as to the superior importance of one element in the Cup. This consideration would modify some modern theories on the subject.

Recent Foreign Theology.

Old Testament.

1. *Précis de Linguistique Sémitique*. This is a translation into French of Professor Brockelmann's *Semitische Sprachwissenschaft*, which was published in 1906. The translation has been made by W. MARÇAIS, Directeur de la Médersa d'Alger, et M. COHEN, Agrégé de l'Université de Paris (Paris: Paul Geuthner, 1910).

2. *Verbesserungen zu Mandelkerns Grosser Konkordanz*. Mandelkern's Hebrew Concordance is

a great book. But every concordance contains mistakes, and it is known that Mandelkern's has its share of them. Here is a supplementary volume to lie beside it. Professor Dr. Sven Herner has corrected more than four thousand mistakes (Lund: Hjalmar Möller).

3. *Les Livres de Samuel*. It is surely interesting to learn that a Commentary on the Books of Samuel has been written in Jerusalem. The author, Père Paul Dhorme, is a professor in the École biblique de Saint-Étienne in Jerusalem.

And it is no mean commentary. It contains, first of all, a new translation of the books, a scholar's translation done into idiomatic French, and depending on a thorough knowledge of the difficulties of the text of Samuel and what has been done to resolve them. It contains, next, introductions and a critical apparatus. And, finally, it contains very full notes on the Hebrew text, the most original part of which is the use that is made of Palestinian exploration. But there is scarcely a writer on the Books of Samuel in any department of study, or in any language, that has escaped the notice of this able expositor (Paris: Victor Lecoffre, 1910).

4. *Die Esra-Apokalypse*. This is the title which Dr. Bruno Violet has given to his edition of 2 Esdras. If such a distinctive title could be generally adopted it would be a considerable gain. At present the book is sometimes called 2 Esdras, the title used in the Apocrypha of the Revised Version; sometimes 3 Esdras, as in the Septuagint; and sometimes 4 Esdras, as in the Vulgate.

Dr. Violet's edition, which belongs to the famous series entitled *Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte*, will certainly

be accepted, when it is complete, as the standard edition of the book. As yet only the first volume has been published, containing the Latin text and, in parallel columns, the translation into German of all the other texts—Syriac, Ethiopic, Arabic (both editions), except the Armenian, which is given in Latin. The introduction to this volume contains an account of the various texts. It is minute and reliable. But this important book must be dealt with at greater length when the second volume appears (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1910. M.17.50).

5. *Conférences de Saint-Étienne*. Under this title have been published seven essays of an archaeological kind, all written by the professors of the Biblical School of St. Etienne in Jerusalem. The first essay is on Babylonian Origins, by Père Dhorme. In the second Père Lagrange gives an account of the Greek Papyri. The third is an essay on Hebrew Measures in the time of the Gospels. Then come two geographical articles, the first on the Sea of Galilee, the second on Mamre. The last two belong to the history of the Church, the one dealing with the biography of Porphyry, the other with a Patriarch of Jerusalem (Paris: Victor Lecoffre, 1910. Fr.3.50).

Entre Nous.

Skinner's 'Genesis.'

The publication of Skinner's *Genesis* delivers the season of 1909 to 1910 from the charge of mediocrity which has been brought against it. It is a book of amazing learning and as amazing pulpit value. It will increase the reputation of the 'International Critical Commentaries,' a series whose reputation, won by books like Driver's *Deuteronomy*, Allen's *Matthew*, Plummer's *Luke*, and Sanday's *Romans*, is already higher far than that of any series of commentaries in English.

Before going to press we have received another volume of the 'International Critical Commentary.' It is the volume on *The Books of Chronicles*. The Editors are Professor E. L. Curtis of Yale, and Dr. A. A. Madsen of New York.

1 Corinthians vii. 8.

The sentence, 'It is better to marry than to burn' (so in all three common versions, *i.e.* King

James's, British, and American Revisions), is an extremely unfortunate translation. For while it is a literal translation of Paul's words, yet the word 'burn' has been generally assumed to mean something that was not in Paul's thought. The word he used did *not* mean what this English word 'burn' has been assumed to mean in this place.

The Greek word used here, under our English word 'burn,' is quoted by Thayer, in his *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*, as being used six times in the New Testament, three times in the Apocrypha, and five specified times in the Septuagint version of the Old Testament; and these he indicates as its only occurrences. Its root meaning is 'to burn with fire, to set on fire, to kindle.'

In these fourteen instances its meaning and usage is as follows: once for 'literal burning,' 2 P 3¹²; once 'filled with fire,' Eph 6¹⁶; seven

times in the sense of 'refining' (*i.e.* five times in the Septuagint, and in Rev 1¹⁵ 3¹⁸); three times 'to be angry, or incensed, or indignant,' in the Apocrypha quotation; once for grief and indignation intermingled, 2 Co 11²⁹; and once in the passage we are talking about.

It will be seen at once that the sexual sense, commonly put into the word 'burn' here, is no part of the original thought of the word Paul uses. And, furthermore, that sense is never associated with it. The word gets its accepted meaning in each case from its connexion. Applying that rule here, it refers to a condition of love which has grown up in two human hearts for each other.

The word 'continency' in v.⁹ ('contain' in the common version) should be noticed too. Its more common usage among us is regarding chastity. But the word Paul uses simply means *self-control* regarding all things.

Following now the rule of reading the meaning of words from their connexional use, vv.^{8,9} would read:

(⁸) 'But now to the unmarried young people, and to the widowed, I would say this: It is good for them if they remain unmarried. (⁹) But if their affection and longing for a life companion be greater than can with sweet content be repressed, let them marry. For it is better to marry than to be in a state of feverish unrest because of unsatisfied love.'¹ S. D. GORDON.

Is it I, Rabbi?

Out of the darkness, yearning for the light,

I saw Thy sign and followed from afar,
Until above Thy presence, shining bright,

Hovered the mystic star:

With the poor shepherds, poor to Thee I came,

And the strange pity of Thy new life saw—
Eternity bound in our human frame,

God in a little straw!

Later Thy hand clasped mine, and gently led

My faltering steps to knowledge fairer still:
I knew Thee in the breaking of the Bread,

Knew Thee and loved Thy will.

Yea, I have talked with Thee, seen Thine eyes
melt

In pity o'er the sorrows of mankind,
Dipped my hand with Thee in the dish, and felt
Love kindle heart and mind.

¹ *The Quietest Talk* (Fleming H. Revell Co.; 6d. net).

Can he that dippeth with Thee, then, betray,
Deny Thee? Ah, what bitter pain were mine,
Should those sad eyes at last be turned away
In agony Divine!

I see Thee hanging on the awful Rood,

I hear Thy mournful, broken-hearted cry:
'One is a traitor.' Oh, ingratitude!

Master, it *is* not I?¹

RICHARD L. MANGAN, S.J.

From Boyhood to Manhood.

Mr. David Williamson has written a book for young men, and called it *From Boyhood to Manhood* (R.T.S.; 1s. net). It contains some good advice, and also some good anecdotes. Here are three of the anecdotes:

Dr. Adam Clarke, the Biblical commentator, was famous as an early riser, like most eminent students. A young preacher was anxious to discover how Dr. Clarke managed it. 'Do you pray about it?' he asked. 'No; I get up,' was Dr. Clarke's simple reply.

The Duke of Wellington was once asked who were the best soldiers in the world. He replied, 'The British soldiers, for they are braver for five minutes longer than the others.'

Dr. Gunsaulus, an eminent Chicago preacher, was once preparing a sermon, when his nephew, Will McLaughlin, asked him what it was about. 'I am going to preach on the text, "But for this cause came I into the world,"' said Dr. Gunsaulus. 'I am treating these words of Christ as symbolizing the great idea that each one of us comes into this world for a definite work.'

The young man went out. He was eighteen, a brilliant student, a splendid athlete, and an earnest Christian. As he passed down the street, Will McLaughlin came to the Iroquois Theatre, and as Dr. Gunsaulus was going to preach there next day, he decided to look in. Hardly had he entered than cries of 'Fire!' reached him. In five minutes that new building was filled with flames, and a mass of humanity—struggling, imprisoned, scorched, trampled upon, and finally suffocated—was in dire peril. McLaughlin rushed to the fire-escape opposite the third-storey window of the North-Western University Law School. He stood there, helping seventeen women and children across a narrow plank from the Law School. The

¹ *The Catholic World*, April, 1910.

heat was terrific, his hands were burned terribly, and he was urged to step into safety before it was too late. But suddenly he was thrown down under an avalanche of dead victims of the fire. They carried him into the Law Schools, but even then he thought of others. He raised his poor burnt hand and said to the doctor: 'I am going to die. Give your attention to the women and children, doctor. I am going to die, and I am prepared.'

They sent for his uncle, and as Dr. Gunsaulus sat by the dying hero, he said to the preacher: 'But—but—for this cause came I into the world.' Before death came to Will McLaughlin, he said, 'I knew that I was following Christ, and I could not do otherwise.' The words are now inscribed on a piece of the plank where he stood, and they witness to the life-sacrifice he made so nobly:

The Son of God goes forth to war,
A kingly crown to gain;
His blood-red banner streams afar:
Who follows in His train?
Who best can drink His cup of woe,
Triumphant over pain,
Who patient bears His cross below,
He follows in His train.

The true story which follows indicates the almost incredible ignorance of missionary history that prevails not simply in the street, but in the Press. *Scene*: A mission-house in London, Monday, May 2, 1910. Telephone bell rings. 'Is that the — Missionary Society?' 'Yes.' 'Oh, we are *The Daily* —. We want information about these cannibalistic acts on Savage Island in the Pacific. May we have an interview with Rev. James Chalmers? We understand that he is an expert on cannibals.' 'Very sorry, but Mr. Chalmers was himself eaten by cannibals some time ago.' 'Dear, dear, how very sad! Good day!'¹

The Great Text Commentary.

The best illustrations this month have been found by the Rev. Donald Henry, M.A., Whithorn, and the Rev. L. Arpee, Nelsonville, Ohio, to each of whom a copy of Dykes's *Christian Minister* will be sent.

Illustrations for the Great Text for August must be received by the 1st of July. The text is Rev 22¹⁷.

¹ *Christian World*, May 5, 1910.

The Great Text for September is Ps 1⁸—'And he shall be like a tree planted by the streams of water, that bringeth forth its fruit in its season, whose leaf also doth not wither; and whatsoever he doeth shall prosper.' A copy of Clarke's *Sixty Years with the Bible*, or Adams's *Israel's Ideal*, or Downer's *Mission and Ministration of the Holy Spirit*, will be given for the best illustration.

The Great Text for October is Ps 4⁶:

'Many there be that say, Who will shew us any good?

Lord, lift thou up the light of thy countenance upon us.'

A copy of Clarke's *Outline of Christian Theology*, or Clarke's *Sixty Years with the Bible*, or Inge's *Faith and Knowledge*, will be given for the best illustration.

The Great Text for November is Ps 8^{3, 4}:

'When I consider thy heavens, the work of thy fingers,

The moon and the stars, which thou hast ordained;

What is man that thou art mindful of him?

And the son of man, that thou visitest him?'

A copy of Leckie's *Authority in Religion*, or Barry's *Ideals and Principles of Church Reform*, along with Anderson's *St. Matthew's Gospel*, will be given for the best illustration.

The Great Text for December is Ps 9^{9, 10}:

'The Lord also will be a high tower for the oppressed,

A high tower in times of trouble;

And they that know thy name will put their trust in thee;

For thou, Lord, hast not forsaken them that seek thee.'

A copy of Durell's *Self-Revelation of our Lord*, or two volumes of Plummer's *English Church History*, will be given for the best illustration.

Those who send illustrations should at the same time name the books they wish sent them if successful.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, St. Cyrus, Montrose, Scotland.